VOL. XV. (No. 3) JANUARY, 1918 No. 59

THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY

PUBLISHED BY
THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY
NEW YORK, U.S.A.

The Theosophical Quarterly

Published by The Theosophical Society at
159 Warren Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Price for non-members, $1.00 per annum; single copies, 25 cents.

In Europe single numbers may be obtained from and subscriptions sent to Dr. Archibald Keightley, 46 Brook Street, London, W., England. Price, 5s.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XV., No. 3.

PAGE

NOTES AND COMMENTS 201

THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS, VII 210

WHY I JOINED THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY 224

FROM THE HIGHLANDS OF LEMURIA, IV 235

ALSACE AND LORRAINE 244

THE CRUSADES 259

EASTERN AND WESTERN PSYCHOLOGY, V 265

ON THE SCREEN OF TIME 273

HIGHER AND LOWER NATURE 286

REVIEWS 290

Egotism in German Philosophy.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS 293

How develop vision? How cultivate right feeling? What is Rationale of intercessory prayer? Correspondence.

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

The principal aim and object of this Society is to form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste or color. The subsidiary objects are: The study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences, and the demonstration of the importance of such study; and the investigation of the unexplained laws of nature and the psychical powers latent in man.

Entered July 17, 1903, at Brooklyn, N. Y., as second-class matter, under Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

Copyright, 1918, by The Theosophical Society.

HARVARD COLLEGE
JAN 16 1918
LIBRARY

NOTES AND COMMENTS

JANUARY, 1918

The Theosophical Society, as such, is not responsible for any opinion or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.

The Karma of the Russians

WE were told, on high authority, in the last issue of the Theosophical Quarterly, that this period of the World War is "a day when men are being sifted—as individuals, as organizations, as nations. It is an accounting day in the Lodge, and the Ledgers are being balanced . . ." In the light of a sentence like that, what can be more appalling than the present position of Russia, where a nation, once counted among the Allies, seems determined to cover itself with undying shame. To such a point has the "Russian Revolution" come. Yet there were many, and among them a man so wise as General Jan Christian Smuts, who, at the outset, hailed that revolution as perhaps the greatest event of the world war: a pronouncement that today sounds like the bitterest irony.

We have been counseled always to look beneath events for the motive which gives them life; we have been told, further, that "by their fruits ye shall know them." By what profound corruption of motive can we account for the fruit of dishonor that the Russian revolution bears?

As to the forces for the moment dominant, the so-called "Bolshevik Socialists," there is no great mystery about their motives. They are explicit enough in their declarations, and quite clear as to the goal they have in view. From the beginning, they planned to get hold of the Russian army, in order to carry through what they call "the social revolution" in Russia. But their ultimate purpose covers the whole world; if they succeed in Russia, they will immediately start an active campaign here, for they have plenty of ardent disciples in America, nay, in the very centre of New York. Among the Petrograd Bolsheviki, very few leaders seem to be Russian by blood. Most of them talked a dialect of German as their mother-tongue and they still think in that German dialect. Completely turning their backs on the faith of their fathers as

an absurd and outgrown superstition, they have accepted Karl Marx—and Marx in his most violent and destructive moods—as their Messiah; the reign of "the proletariat" represents for them "the coming of the kingdom."

Like Karl Marx, they are, for the most part, thoroughly materialistic and anti-Christian; when they think about philosophical ideas, they are atheists; but generally they think of one thing only—material wealth and power. They have in mind a world-empire with themselves as leaders, an empire enriched with the plunder of existing governments, whom they ferociously call "armed robbers." But Karl Marx's formulas, with the spoliation of "the proletariat" by "the capitalistic classes" date from 1850; that is, nine or ten years before Darwin's idea of evolution came into the world; therefore Marx, though a thorough-going materialist, is not an evolutionist. He could never see, as Darwin so clearly sees, that free competition is the greatest instrument of progress, and therefore of general enrichment. Brought up in a narrow and densely egotistic corner of German thought, Marx could never see that the one guarantee of progress and general enrichment is free opportunity for the exceptionally gifted men, with a reward sufficient to spur them to extraordinary exertion; exertion which invariably results in general enrichment and betterment. Marx could only see the result, the reward, of exceptional power; he could never see, and these followers of his, for the most part men of his race, can never see, first, the exceptional power which these rewards simply register; and, secondly, that while the gifted man makes a fortune for himself, he invariably raises a wave of well-being, that enriches all his neighbors at the same time. He could never see, what is really quite simple and elementary, that the rich man, the gifted man whose power has brought great rewards, can profit by his wealth in one way only: by paying other people for services, and so immediately restoring the general level of wealth.

Marx declares, and these fanatical followers of his believe, that the labor of "the proletariat" creates all wealth; they are incapable of seeing that, without thought, without intelligence, without the guiding and organizing will, labor can create almost no wealth; and that it is the exceptional gifted man who supplies these things, and therefore really creates wealth.

So, obstinately blind to the forces of intelligence and will, and with greedy eyes fixed only on the rewards, the results of these, Marx and his Bolshevik followers ferociously denounce the gifted men as "robbers," and call on "the proletariat" to pull them down and despoil them, thus taking back for labor the wealth which, they say, labor alone has created.

It is a wild, explosive, destructive philosophy. But we must take the pains to understand it, as an indispensable measure of safety; for,

within a very short time, we shall face exactly the same kind of movement, with like leaders and the same convictions, that have been raging for eight months in Petrograd.

The Lenins and Trotskys believe themselves to be the apostles of Marx, the new Messiah, apostles destined to lead "the proletariat" into the promised land; and their promised land is wholly material; they have no ideal that could not be gratified by money and more money.

These Lenin-Trotsky agitators are aliens in Russia, alien to the great mass of Russians in blood and creed; they admit this quite frankly themselves, and say they are not Russians but citizens of the world. Having for centuries had no nationality themselves, but being dispersed among all nations, they deny the fact and value of nationality, which is the creation, they say, of "the capitalistic classes." But, since their mother tongue is a dialect of German—and this is quite as true in New York as it is in Petrograd—and since their gospel, *Das Kapital,* is written in German, they find themselves more in sympathy with Germany than with any other nation. And they have no radical quarrel with the German State, since the German State is the greatest and most successful experiment in Socialism that the world has ever seen; nay, the German army, with its destruction of individual will and initiative, is through and through Socialistic and communistic.

So it happens that the Lenin-Trotsky agitators are congenitally pro-German, in New York as in Petrograd. A very slight modification of the German State—the substitution of a Marxian tyrant for the Hohenzollern tyrant, and it would suit them perfectly. Even now, Germany almost realizes their ideals.

One thing more: these men, whether in Russia or in the United States (we shall do well to get it into our heads that they form a single, closely-knit organization there and here) have no scruples at all, as we understand scruples; they are thoroughly Germanic in that. They are logical too, for they scoff at the idea of spiritual law, and recognize nothing as real except brute materialism, purely material gains to be won by all available means. They frankly say they have not the slightest objection to bloodshed; nay, their ideal is, to pour out the blood of the "bourgeois class," the "capitalistic class," which has so long, they say, ground down the proletariat in degrading slavery. It is a philosophy of militant materialism.

These Lenin-Trotsky agitators thoroughly believe in using all weapons that come to their hands; and words are among the most potent of weapons. Therefore they mouth fine phrases about "world democracy." and "the revolution." We in America attach certain meanings

to these words. Democracy, for us, means ordered liberty under the American Constitution. The Revolution means the great historic episode made splendid by the genius of Washington and his generation. And these words on the tongues of the Lenin-Trotsky agitators have deluded us—profoundly deluded us—into believing that they hold similar ideals. That is a wide and dangerous delusion. Democracy, for them, means a new class tyranny, with themselves as tyrants; the revolution, for them, means the destruction of the whole existent order, and the substitution of militant materialism.

Naturally, these Lenin-Trotsky agitators are profoundly and blatantly indifferent to "the honor of Russia." National honor, they say, is merely a selfish "capitalistic" trick, to make slaves of the workers, so that they may lay down their lives for "the capitalistic classes." As has been already said, they plan to get hold of Russia, and of the Russian army, in order to force their tyranny on the whole world, by a destructive international revolution and war. For them, therefore, the Russian revolution is the golden opportunity, the corner-stone of the kingdom of their Messiah. That is what the Bolshevik leaders, the Lenins and Trotskys think about the Russian revolution.

These men constitute one of the two revolutions which started at the same time in Petrograd last March. We come now to the other revolution. It was put in motion by the Duma leaders, as a protest against two things: the ineptitude of some of the Tsar's ministers, an ineptitude which brought immense disasters upon Russia; and the open treason of others, who were, they believed, planning to bring about a separate peace with Germany, thus betraying the Allies of Russia into the hands of the enemy. These men, led by the great figures in the Duma, men like Rodzianko, Milyukoff and Gutchkoff, and by the great Zemstvo organizers, like Prince Lvoff, had a perfectly definite plan—which has failed completely. They intended to try, first, to pursuade Nicholas II to dismiss such ministers as Stuermer and Protopopoff, and to put in their places men acceptable to the Duma. In other words, they wanted to repeat, for Russia, the change which took place in England between the reign of George III (whose ministers were completely responsible to him) and the reign of George V (whose ministers are completely responsible to the popular House of Parliament). The American Constitution, drawn up in the reign of George III, has embodied and stereotyped the practice then in force, so that our American "ministers of State" are not responsible directly to our Parliament; they are not chosen from Congress, nor appointed by Congress, nor can they (except in the hardly thinkable case of impeachment) be dismissed by Congress. Therefore we are in a position to understand the Tsar's point of view. At any rate, he refused to choose ministers acceptable to, and responsible

to, the Duma, though he did, under pressure from the Duma, dismiss the pro-German Premier, Stuermer.

The Duma leaders then determined to force the Tsar's abdication, when they intended to recognize his young son Alexis as heir, guided by a Council of Regency named by themselves—probably consisting of themselves. This, their first plan, failed, because Nicholas II refused to be separated from his son, to whom he is devotedly attached, and who was constantly with him at army headquarters, from the time the Tsar himself took command of the Russian forces. The Duma leaders then developed a second plan: to name the Tsar's younger brother Michael, Emperor, governing with a constitutional ministry responsible to the Duma, a ministry which would in all likelihood have included themselves. This plan also failed, because Grand Duke Michael was willing to accept the throne only in case the Russian nation, in a Constitutional Convention, or Constituent Assembly—the American and French names for the same thing—should express its absolute approval of that arrangement. Therefore the Duma leaders decided to do two things: they planned a Constituent Assembly, primarily to pronounce upon the candidacy of Grand Duke Michael; and they formed a Temporary or Provisional Government, to carry on the business of administration, until the Constituent Assembly could be got together.

On the face of it, their plans appear plausible. For without doubt there were pro-German influences among the Tsar's ministers; without doubt there were powerful pro-German currents in the court of the Russian Empress, a German princess by birth. And, in all probability, had the Emperor Nicholas been immediately replaced by his brother, as Michael II, with a strong national ministry formed of tried and trusted leaders, Russia would have gone on fighting among the Allies, as gallantly as she fought during the late Spring and Summer of 1916. There was that possibility, which may, in part, justify the Duma leaders. But there are two further considerations: first, the proverbial practical danger of "swapping horses while crossing the stream"; second, the grave moral question of loyalty. As to the practical question, we can see now that Russia, so far from doing more for the Allies because of the revolution, has done infinitely worse than the worst mistakes of the imperial régime, even if it was honeycombed by German agents, as we are told. The practical result has been disastrous. The Duma leaders, therefore, stand convicted of an act of almost measureless folly, judging that act by its fruits. And there is a strong suspicion that they fell into this act of folly because they were blinded by vanity and personal ambition, two evil counsellors, who open the doors wide to the Powers of Evil. If they allowed themselves to be blinded to the possible and even probable dangers in their path, because they wished to become ministers themselves—as they did, in fact, become—then their culpability is great. They

will stand condemned of a colossal blunder which was, at the same time, a crime.

But far deeper than this practical question is the spiritual question: the question of that Loyalty which "surpasses all." What are the evils that today rage and devastate the Russian State? They are, each and all, forms of disloyalty. The soldiers are disloyal to their officers—to the point of assassinating them. The workmen, munition-makers, railroad men, are disloyal to their duty, crassly indifferent to the consequent danger of their brothers at the front. But, far worse, the whole nation, so far as the Russian nation can be said to have any existence today, is soaked through and through with disloyalty. We remember how severely the Duma leaders, men like Rodzianko and Milyukoff, berated the Tsar's ministers and the court of the Empress for plotting a separate peace with Germany. That plot was, in reality, the excuse they gave to the world for the revolution: the danger, they said, was so imminent that instant surgical action must be taken. But what is the upshot of the revolution? What was the outcome, from the very first? The army practically ceased to fight. An armistice in fact began as soon as the revolution was consummated; and the formal armistice signed early in December only recognizes a fact that has been in existence for nearly nine months. There was, it is true, one forward movement at the beginning of July; but it was made by a portion of the army which the "revolution" had not yet reached. It was wholly due to the momentum of the old imperial discipline, at that one point still intact.

So the revolution has led to betrayal and treachery: treachery and betrayal of the nation's faith, smirching and staining the honor of the Russian army, which had fought at times with heroic valor for the Allies' holy cause; base and gross betrayal, next, of the invaded provinces of Russia, ground under the heel of Teutonic tyranny; most cowardly betrayal of Poland, Serbia, Montenegro and Rumania, to which Russia was bound by the most imperative ties of honor; and, greatest of all, a foul betrayal of the Western Allies,—France, Britain and Italy; betrayal of the cause of Humanity, of the sacred cause for which fight the holy spiritual powers. Where, after the war, can Russia look for friends? It is practically certain that Russia's greedy seizure of a "premature and traitorous peace," will prolong the war by many months, probably by years; for the enemy has now begun to hope for further treason and cowardice, and sees in that cowardice and treason a good hope of ultimate triumph, a wholesale surrender of mankind to Teuton despotism. But it is certain that this prolonging of the war will inflict heavy suffering on the already tried and heavily burdened Allies—on every one of the nations that stands firm. To begin with the United States, there will be, in all likelihood a million families, bereaved and orphaned, who will clearly see that their bereavement is due to Teuton ambition—and Russian

poltroonery. They will hardly view "the youngest democracy" with very friendly eyes. Nor will Italy, the enslaved inhabitants of eastern Venetia, feel deep gratitude to the Russians, who have given them into the hands of their age-long oppressors. England and her younger dominions which, with one disgraceful exception, have striven and suffered heroically, will hardly be counted among Russia's future friends. And, finally, France, in fact involved in this war and in all the horrors and abominations which she has suffered from her bestial invaders, precisely because she loyally kept her faith with Russia—what will France say to her traitorous ally? There remains to Russia the "friendship" of the Teutons—the friendship of the wolves for the sheep. The essence of the matter is, that this long and fatal chain of betrayal and disloyalty was begun by the disloyalty of the Duma leaders who, in their blindness and ambition, broke their own oath of allegiance, in effect saying to the army: "In the name of our disloyalty, be loyal to us!"

But there was a second act of disloyalty; perhaps we should rather call it an act of blind folly. One episode of the "revolution" has been veiled in darkness, where so much has been paraded in full daylight: We have not yet been told what terms were made by the Duma leaders, to buy the support of the revolutionary Socialists for the political changes they wished to bring about. But, while the terms of that treaty have been carefully hidden from the world, the result is appallingly clear. It is a repetition of the stories of mediæval black magic, in which, to gain success, men signed a bond with the powers of darkness. They got the success they bargained for—and then came the payment of the bond, the forfeit of their souls. So the Duma leaders signed their bond and got their success; but they had put themselves into the hands of the powers of destruction, and now the mortgage has been foreclosed.

But, we may ask ourselves, what of the Russian army? What of the men in the ranks? What inducements made such an appeal to them that they have so obstinately trodden the path of dishonor? In the first place, release from discipline, from the military obligation of obedience. It may, perhaps, be urged in extenuation that the path of disloyalty and insubordination was opened wide to them by the very men who should have safeguarded them, the Duma leaders of the "constitutional" revolution. Without doubt this is true, and, to their already crushing heavy account, we must add this supreme act of folly, forced upon the Duma leaders by their Socialist allies. It was an act of folly, and of the utmost vanity also; these men persuaded themselves that they were giving a lesson in true progress to all mankind—to the old, effete nations like France and England, which maintain "the outworn superstition" of implicit military obedience. But, even though the Duma leaders must bear the heaviest responsibility for this act of final folly, this by no means exonerates the soldiers, the men of the rank and file. The path

was opened wide for them; true, but the path of evil is always open wide; "broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction." The powers of evil see to that. The main culpability of the Russian rank and file would seem to lie precisely in this: that, from the very beginning, they have opened their ears wide to every counsel of evil. Evil listening has been their capital fault.

First, the eager desire to escape from discipline. Next, sloth and cowardice, in the face of the foe. We have been told in extenuation, that these men are weary; that they have been fighting bravely, under great hardships, often with incompetent, perhaps even traitorous backing, since the beginning of the war. But in reality the men on the battle-line have been again and again reinforced; a large proportion of those who are capitulating now, have seen little active service. Nor has the fighting been continuous. During practically the whole winter of 1916-1917, they were neither attacking nor attacked; they were being held back, in preparation for a great Spring offensive, which was to repeat and outstrip the triumphs of June 1916; a great offensive which was first checked by the "revolution," then, when it was launched in July, was turned into a disgraceful rout by the "democratization" of the Russian army. Therefore the plea of weariness is only half justified, only half sincere. But let us suppose that they had fought continuously from the first; has not France done the same?—France, involved in the war primarily by her treaty of alliance with Russia, and by her unswerving loyalty, in the face of large bribes and truculent threats, to the obligations of that treaty? The French nation is weary; the French army is weary. Yes, but, like heroes, they make that the reason for fighting with finer valor, with more splendid heroism. There was General Foch's great answer to one of his commanders who, at the Marne, pleaded that his men were weary:" "The enemy is more weary still; attack again!" That has, from the outset, been the unwavering principle and practice of that army of heroes.

Yet another bribe which corrupted the Russian army was even more crude, if possible, more discreditable. They were promised that, if they supported the "revolution" and stopped the war, "the land would be distributed." And they gulped avidly at that bait. The wording of this bribe is ambiguous. Some people have supposed it to mean that the communal land of the Russian villages, now held in many cases jointly under the system of primitive Socialism, was to be divided, to be held in severalty, each peasant receiving and fully owning his own land. If this were really the meaning, then the object would be in itself good; for this communal land tenure, this primitive Socialism, hangs like a millstone round the neck of agricultural Russia. But the meaning is in reality quite different. It is a question of seizing the land of the large holders and dividing it among the peasants; in plain language, an act

of spoliation, of robbery. And nothing speaks so eloquently of the moral baseness of the Russian soldier-peasants as the fact that they are not willing only, but wildly eager, to quit the trenches, in order to secure their share of the spoils, to profit by this "legalized" robbery. Greedy self-indulgence could go no further.

So far, the heavy Karma of the Russian nation. But we shall be well advised not to stop at this point; not to exhaust ourselves in indignant anger at their base betrayal. We shall do well to bring the question home to ourselves. We, who have a part in the Theosophical Movement, have, with that high privilege, a very grave responsibility. We, and we alone, have been told quite openly of the part being played in this world war by the powers of good and the powers of evil. We know, further, the part which spiritual effort must take in this momentous conflict. Let us see whether we too are not in danger of growing weary of the fight; let us look well to the question whether these very bribes, the desire to escape from irksome discipline, sloth, cowardice, self-indulgence, have not, perhaps, a dangerous allurement for ourselves. For we know that, heavy as may be the responsibility which the Law lays upon the Russian soldier, our own responsibility, just because we know far more, must be infinitely greater. "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required. . . ."

As in a vision of the night He stood before me, and in His voice was kindness as He said: "I have come to lead you to hidden treasures." As I followed, my heart grew light, my spirit buoyant. I was conscious of beauty all about me and of a strength unknown before; the fears that had always walked at my side were left behind, I knew not when or where. At last He stopped. "Is this where the treasures are hid?" I asked. "What more do you seek," He answered "than you have found? A world of beauty, a heart of peace, a sense of boundless life. These are the treasures that were hidden in your own soul. I am the spirit of love; by following me you have found yourself."

ANDREW V. V. RAYMOND.

THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS

VII

Mendicant Orders

St. Dominic. The Order of Preachers — Union through Knowledge

EARLY in the 13th century, two Orders were founded, one by St. Dominic, one by St. Francis of Assisi. These are the two great *mendicant* Orders.

The mendicant Orders introduce nothing new into monasticism; they make a new application of an old custom. They raise an old practice into a principle. In doing so, however, they so innovate upon the established principles of St. Benedict, that they are justly regarded as a fresh start taken by monasticism.

In order to correct the evils attendant upon irresponsible monks and hermits who roamed or settled at will, looking for their food to the charitably minded, St. Benedict brought these individuals together into communities. He provided that the community should *earn* its own living. All outgrowths of the parent Benedictine trunk, at Cluny, Citeaux, Chartreux, etc., in maintaining that principle of self-dependence, became great industrial centres as well as houses of religion.

The mendicants retained the community life of St. Benedict, and tried strictly to adhere to the system of services arranged for the "Hours" (Matins, Vespers, etc.). But instead of *earning* its living, the community was required to *beg* it. This difference (and others) is so great that it results in a new type of religious Order. Up to the 13th century the many Orders, great and small, had all been modifications of the Benedictine, essentially a *contemplative* Order. With St. Dominic and St. Francis what we may call a new *family* has its beginning—the family of *active* Orders.

Those who are interested in historical development may well regard this first quarter of the 13th century as a period of great significance. It establishes a second type of monk.

It is impossible for an American and a Protestant to make an unprejudiced approach toward the Dominican Order, on account of the unsavory connection of that Order with the Inquisition. One or two facts however mitigate our prejudices. The first of these facts is, that, notwithstanding much that is righteously detestable in the policy and conduct of Rome, the Roman Catholic Church transmits a tradition that is less distorted than the teaching of any Protestant rival. In the Roman Church the science of the spiritual life is as a mine; in the Protestant Churches, spiritual science merely outcrops in individuals. We must distinguish between what is righteously detestable in Rome, and that which merely cuts across our opinions—well or ill founded. One by one,

in the case of individuals and events, we may have seen our Protestant opinions fall away from us as we studied the facts of the case; examples are: the teaching about Hell, Purgatory and Heaven; about the rights of Rulers; the condemnation of all socialistic tendencies; the insistence upon a religious control over education, the monastic idea. Examples of individuals about whom we may have changed our opinion are such unmodern men as Ignatius Loyola, Thomas Aquinas, and St. Benedict. Gradually an un-Protestant attitude may have replaced former antipathies; without ceasing to detest the Church's policy, we, perhaps, have grown to believe in advance that Rome's summing up of men and events is likely to be correct.

In the present case what is at stake is the judgment upon the twelfth century reformers in the south of France who, under the names Albigenses and Waldensians, are commonly presented in history as martyrs of the Protestant Cause. The Dominican Order arose out of St. Dominic's efforts against those reformers. When Dominic's life and work is narrated, it may be possible to make explanations which will justify him and his canonization.

As a first step toward a fair consideration of St. Dominic's life, we ought to ascertain a few facts to replace the vague horror which, with many individuals, is their sole knowledge of the Inquisition. Let us consult Mr. Henry Charles Lea, a scholar of Philadelphia, whose special field of investigation has been certain matters of Church History. Among other books, Mr. Lea has written two studies that specially concern us. One is a *History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages;* and the other is a *History of the Inquisition in Spain.* These works are in three volumes each, large volumes. They evidence patient study of original sources. The two titles give us our first fact of information. In the early 13th century there was a Papal Inquisition against the heretics in southern France and other disturbers. It is this Inquisition that is connected with the origin of the Dominican Order. Nearly three hundred years later, the Spanish Inquisition came into existence. Mr. Lea describes this latter organization as an essentially national institution, "entirely Spanish and entirely royal," organized by their majesties, Ferdinand and Isabella (patron of Christopher Columbus) against *converted Jews.* The Spanish Inquisition was organized without any suggestion from Rome; it not only aimed at independence from Rome, but, as it grew in power and enlarged its activity, it actually made accusations against high officials of the Church. It was the Spanish Inquisition that persecuted St. Teresa and St. Ignatius Loyola. It was the Spanish Inquisition that lighted so many faggots. Though it is true that members of the Dominican Order were made active in its odious work by the Spanish sovereigns, we must remember that this occurred more than two hundred and fifty years after the death of St. Dominic. Religious Orders degenerate after the death of the founder. We must not hold a saint responsible for the acts of unaspiring followers, centuries after his impulse has died out.

Mr. Lea's attitude toward these matters of Church History seems to us typically Protestant and American. What he says of monasticism is a good example: he calls it a singing of "barren liturgies"—"a selfish effort of the individual to secure his own salvation by repudiating all the duties and responsibilities of life." Mr. Lea's opinions therefore are not likely to err on the side of favour to the Catholics. When we find him, then, stating that the popular attitude toward the Mediaeval Inquisition is one of exaggeration, it is well to pause and give his words due consideration. At the end of the first volume of his study, Mr. Lea summarizes thus: "I am convinced that the number of victims who actually perished at the stake is considerably less than has ordinarily been imagined. The deliberate burning alive of a human being, simply for difference of belief, is an atrocity so dramatic and appeals to strongly to the imagination that it has come to be regarded as the leading feature in the activity of the Inquisition . . . Imagination has grown inflamed at the manifold iniquities of the Holy Office, and has been ready to accept without examination exaggerations which have become habitual." Mr. Lea cites two characteristic Inquisitors in proof of his opinion. He states that one Bernard de Caux "with an enviable record for zeal and activity in the relentless persecution of heresy," in his register from 1246 to 1248 does not record a single burning. The second, the model Inquisitor of this period, Bernard Gui, who vigorously prosecuted the heretical uprisings in southern France, condemned only forty, during fifteen years, to the death penalty.

These facts are certainly less lurid than the vague imaginations usually clouded around the Inquisition. Perhaps we can now approach more open-mindedly the work of St. Dominic. Seventeen years intervene between the death of the great Cistercian, St. Bernard (1153) and the birth of St. Dominic (1170). His family was Spanish. His mother seems to have been truly religious. When her boy was seven years old, she sent him to her brother, a priest, for schooling. After another seven years, Dominic passed on to a higher center of learning, where he spent six years in the usual academic curriculum, and then, four years more in preparation for Ordination in the Church. He was ordained about 1194, as that year he left Palencia, where he had been studying, and took up his duties in the Cathedral at Osma, of which he had been made a canon.

As St. Dominic's Order is a natural evolution from the Order of Canons, it will be well to interrupt the narrative of his life in order to understand what this Order of Canons, now for the first time mentioned, really is.

Canons, though they are usually classed among the four types of monk, are not an Order in the sense that Jesuits, Carthusians, and others are. They are not a branch spreading from the root of a great individuality; they are little local communities, which, after many centuries of existence, were given organization and uniformity by one of the Popes,

as late as 1339. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) thus defines the Order: "The Order of Canons Regular is necessarily constituted by religious clerics, because they are essentially destined to those works which relate to the Divine mysteries, whereas it is not so with the monastic Orders." That is an excellent definition. Canons are priests ("religious clerics") whose duty it is to officiate in the formal Church Services (Holy Communion, Baptism, etc.). Monks do not, *essentially,* have those duties, as a monk need not be a priest. A Canon is a priest without a parish; he officiates in an ecclesiastical establishment that is without parish connections, such as a college chapel or a Cathedral. Usually a group of Canons grew up in connection with a Cathedral, where the Canons live as assistants to the Bishop; they officiate in the Cathedral services, while the Bishop is active in all matters that concern the entire diocese. There is much dispute over the facts of when and by whom Cathedral (or collegiate) priests were first organized into a group bound by a common rule—and no convincing conclusion has been reached. One undisputed historical fact is that St. Augustine, who became Bishop of Hippo (Africa) in 395, maintained, together with the priests who assisted him in the office of Canons, a Rule of life, and resided in community. That Rule, or what is known as that Rule, was adopted, with modifications, by many later Bishops and other leaders, notably, as we shall see, by St. Dominic, who made it the foundation of his own Rule.

The Canons' Rule (or St. Augustine's Rule—it will be discussed later in this article) was less strict that the Monastic Rule. The Canons usually kept the "Hours"; but the hard manual labour, the solitude and seclusion were no part of a Canon's life. Occasionally, however, we do find certain Bishops prescribing labour, as in the case of the celebrated Bishop of Metz, Chrodegang, who in 763 brought together his Canons into a community and adapted for them the Rule of St. Benedict and that of St. Augustine. Canons did not take the vow of poverty and could possess property. The Canon's Rule seems a compromise between life in the world and life in a cloister, a rule suited for those who wish to lead a *religious* life, but who are hindered by certain causes from entering a formal religious Order. For that reason, perhaps, the Canon's Rule became very popular about the year 1100, when, as we have seen, some of the austere Orders like the Carthusian and Cistercian, were being formed. So popular indeed did it become, that in certain well known cases, the meaning of the word *canon* (a priest attached to a cathedral or college) was either deliberately or unconsciously overlooked, and the word came to be used to denote communities of priests, of a grade less strict than monks, but living under an Abbot, and engaged in parochial work. Such were the White Canons of Prémontré (a large abbey near Soissons), and those of St. Victor, near Paris. The founder of the latter, William of Champeaux, (1106) will be remembered as the friend who had St. Bernard placed under obedience to a physician, when the austerities at Clairvaux seemed unreasonable. St. Norbert, the founder

of Prémontré, (1120) was also a close friend of St. Bernard's, and St. Bernard is said to have given him the land on which the home of the White Canons was built.

The original use of the word "Canon," a member of a Cathedral Staff, and the second meaning, a cloistered priest who is less strictly secluded than a monk, continued together. Later, in the 12th Century, a distinction was made between "regular" and "secular" Canons. The word "regular" describes those Canons who adopt a Rule of life. "Seculars" are those who do not adopt any such rule.

About 1194 St. Dominic finished his period of formal scholastic preparation and went to the Cathedral of Osma as a Canon. The Bishop of Osma had given to his Cathedral Staff the Rule of St. Augustine as their guide. Dominic found this rule of life so congenial that in a few years he became sub-prior of the community, and shortly after, prior. Nine uneventful years were spent at Osma; they seem to have been a period of spiritual preparation.

Dominic's active career began in 1203. The King of Castile in that year sent the Bishop of Osma on a mission to arrange a marriage for the Prince. The Bishop took with him his faithful canon, Dominic. The two travellers, passing from Spain through Provence (the southern part of France) were brought into contact with members of the Albigensian sect. That brief contact stirred in Dominic's heart a desire to preach the truth to these misguided people, and to save them from their error. His wish was soon realized. In 1204 the Bishop of Osma, with his canon, Dominic, was in Rome, asking permission from the Pope to resign as bishop and to go as missionary to the interior of Russia. The Pope sent him instead, to the interior of Provence as missionary to the Albigenses.

The Albigenses and kindred sects, like the Waldensian, have been described in other articles published by the THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY,* and they have been too frequently mentioned and defended by historians and Protestant theologians to make necessary now a discussion of their position. Practical, moral virtues they had, indisputably. The clergy of the period, even the monks contrasted unfavorably with them in this respect. Dominic clearly recognized the self-denial, and simplicity of their lives. He recognized it so clearly as to realize that it must be offset by corresponding austerity in those, who, by intellectual argument, were endeavoring to expose the errors of the Albigensian doctrines.

It was to meet their practical morality, that, after uncertainty and discussion, Dominic finally decided on the vow of poverty and upon the principle of mendicancy for his own followers. Albigensian virtues, therefore, are unquestionable. But an old proverb attributes many practical virtues to the Devil himself. And we have read of the self-denial and austerities practised by members of the Black Lodge. Indisputable practical morality,—rare as it is, unfortunately, and precious—

* Mystical Movements of the Middle Ages, January, 1907. The Mission of Certain Heresies, July, 1916. The Foundations of the Moravian Church, January, 1917.

does not excuse other forms of sin, which, though they may be called sins of misunderstanding, of the intellect, nevertheless have their origin in subtler forms of immoral volition. Are not many Socialists, and all varieties of mental scientists upheld today by reason of their blameless lives—until a study of their teachings brings us to see that those apparently blameless lives are in truth pestiferous. The Albigenses seem to be in the same category with Socialists and Scientists (Mental, Christian, etc.). They had laid hold of a distortion of the "hidden wisdom." They seem even more blameworthy than contemporary heretics, and more dangerous, because they had penetrated further beneath the veils of the "secret doctrine." Fundamentally, however, their error seems to have been the same as that of present day sowers of dissension and discord—namely, inability to believe a paradox. The Albigenses had a staunch faith in the "Realities of the Spiritual World." But by reason of that staunch faith, they denied there was any reality in institutions and ordinances of the physical world that are commonly regarded as *representative* of spiritual realities. For example they denied the validity of the Church, its Sacraments, etc. It is a common error,—this inability to hold fast to a paradox,—it is the error of Christian Science, for example. It is moral blindness as the consequence of some sin—an inability to perceive that while only the Absolute is strictly "real," nevertheless all manifested things have a "relative reality." The true "secret doctrine" unfolds a teaching altogether different from the heresy of the Albigenses, and of others. (See *The Secret Doctrine* by H. P. Blavatsky, Vol. I, pp. 71, 72, edition of 1893). "Only when we shall have reached absolute Consciousness and blended our own with it, shall we be free from the delusions produced by Maya." "Maya, or Illusion, is an element which enters into all finite things, for everything that exists has only a relative, not an absolute reality . . . *Nevertheless all things are relatively real, for the cognizer is also a reflection, and the things cognized are therefore as real to him as himself.*" Madame Blavatsky thus stated the paradox of Truth. Those are fortunate whose Karma enables them to grasp her words and to act upon them.

The Dominican Order arose out of that mission to the heretics of southern France entrusted by the Pope to the Bishop of Osma, and his faithful companion, in 1204. The Order became great and powerful because it supplied a true need. It did not arise out of individual aspiration or caprice, as Orders sometimes seem to originate. The Dominican Order was a natural growth, an evolution. It came into existence through the failure of the Cistercian Order to meet an emergency which it was not its function to meet. It was as if a new organ were needed by the religious body. Nature quickly developed the required organ—it was the Dominican *Order of Preachers.*

The Dominican is an *active* Order; the Cistercian, a *contemplative.* The relation of the new Order to the Cistercian is close, however—perhaps like that of a hand to the arm.

St. Bernard's career, his practical wisdom, his influence are dazzling. He dwarfs statesmen and politicians. But, as we read his letters, written from Germany and other quarters of western Europe, and read his longing for Clairvaux and the cloister life—perhaps we felt a regret that he permitted himself to be drawn away from that cloister and enter into the maelstrom of statecraft. What if he did possess power and influence greater than kings and popes! That is to be expected. Religion develops such faculty in its disciples. The affairs of the world were, nevertheless, not the province of the Cistercians or of St. Bernard. We must regard as a waste of energy the power he diverted from the channels of Contemplation for straightening the crooked courses of earth; because, by broadening those channels, he could have given to the more powerful forces of the spiritual world more untrammeled access to earth. What he did was to give his own illumined energy—it was great and splendid—to the tangled skein of statecraft. What he might have done was lay another cable from earth to heaven. It is not surprising, therefore, that St. Bernard's efforts among the Albigenses had a very impermanent result. The heresy was powerful and dangerous in his day, sixty years before Dominic began to combat it. In 1145, Bernard went south to stay the tide of evil in those southern provinces. The conditions he found are quoted from him by many historians. "The churches are deserted, the basilicas without worshippers, the people without priests, the priests exposed to contempt, and Christians without Christ! They strip our temples as bare as synagogues, they rob our sacraments of all that is sacred, they deprive our solemn days of their august solemnity! Men die in their sins; and their souls alas! pass from this life to the dread tribunal of God, without having been reconciled by the sacrament of penance, or fortified by holy communion."* In some places that Bernard visited a temporary enthusiasm was shown; in others, he was not even listened to. The permanent result of his mission was *nil*. Fifty years after his death the Pope called upon the Abbot of Citeaux to undertake a mission in Provence to these same heretics. The Bishop of Osma's visit to Rome coincided with that action of the Pope; he, too, was told to convert the heretics of Provence. In order to work in co-operation with the Cistercian Abbot, the Bishop with Dominic went from Rome to Citeaux, and left Citeaux in 1205 for the field of their labour.

The decade from 1205 to 1216 is the period of formation of the Order which constituted itself formally at the beginning of 1216, and received official approval and authority from Rome in December, 1216. The characteristic features of the Dominican Order were moulded by the pressure of events in the heretical provinces of southern France.

The Abbot of Citeaux was the ranking chief of the mission, and the Bishop of Osma was subordinate. The Bishop returned to Spain in 1207 to solicit money for the mission, leaving Dominic in France. The Bishop died that same year. Dominic was thus left to work alone upon the

* Ratisbonne, *Life of St. Bernard*, p. 330.

situation, practically as leader, for, from the beginning, the Bishop and Dominic had shown themselves the positive and constructive agents among the missioners.

Let us now consider the characteristics of St. Dominic's Order and the events that moulded it. First of all, it is a *preaching* Order—it is the Order of Friars Preachers. That function distinguishes it sharply from the Orders so far studied. Their aim is the same as the Dominican, namely, the salvation of souls. But the older Orders are contemplative. Their method is, through prayer, meditation and contemplation (and their accessories, manual labour, etc.) to advance the individual soul along the road to Reality, and also, through the prayers and meditations of the individual monks and of the community, to accumulate a spiritual force available for the salvation of others who, themselves, may or may not be praying. The Dominican method was devised to meet the case of misbelievers who needed their fallacies exposed by the logic of preaching. The new Order is a splendid example of a leader meeting adversaries on their own ground and vanquishing them by their own weapons. The heresy had spread widely because of great elasticity in the matter of preaching. While the heretics kept a form of hierarchical organization with their own bishops, etc., their laymen were sent out to do a kind of Salvation Army work, corresponding to our modern street corner preaching; these lay preachers thus carried the doctrine to those who would not take the trouble to go to the doctrine. They were successful. St. Bernard, in his effort to check the tide of heretical progress, had written to the people of Toulouse a warning against these itinerants. His letter reads thus: "I repeat to you my earnest recommendations never to receive amongst you any preacher who has not received a mission from the Holy See (Rome) or the approbation of your Bishop. These foreign preachers bear the appearance of piety, but they possess not its spirit. They conceal their poison under the appearance of sweetness; and they have the art to wrap up their profane novelties in divine language. Distrust these persons as men who would poison you." Dominic opposed to these footloose preachers, unhampered by parish and diocesan ties, an association of preachers equally unhampered, men who need not be priests, "free from any parochial ministry, exempted from the authority of the Bishop, and devoting themselves solely to preaching wherever need arose." Dominic's association of Preachers resulted from his quick perception of conditions and events. A wave of censure had been the only response to the Abbot of Cîteaux when he entered upon the mission. The Abbot and his companions were journeying with horses. The Pharisaical heretics at once condemned them: "See the ministers of a God who went only on foot, riding; the wealthy missionaries of a God who was poor; the envoys of a God Who was humble and despised, loaded with honours." Dominic at once proceeded to undermine that condemnation by persuading the Abbot to abandon his cumbrous impedimenta, and to trust the issue of the campaign to the foot soldiers.

A second characteristic is: the Dominicans are *intellectual*. As he had met the Albigenses with their own weapons on the ground of morality and teaching, so Dominic again by clear and logical thought opposed the Albigenses where they were most complacent and vain. It was said that the heretics had apprehended a distorted form of occult truth. Pluming themselves upon their superior knowledge and wisdom, they looked with scorn upon those who were merely orthodox and exoteric. Popular preaching had spread the heresy among the lower classes. Pseudo-occultism would seem to have won the upper class. Many of the most affluent of the nobles were among the misbelievers. Dominic arranged, at several of the noble castles, a debate with his opponents. A subject was chosen, preparation made, books and authorities marshalled —finally the arguments themselves began in the presence of the count or knight and a large audience. Some of these debates lasted a week.

These two characteristics—intellectual acumen and evangelical zeal (like Wesley's, for example) for the salvation of souls, are not always to be looked for in combination in every Dominican. But if we take as examples two typical Dominican Saints, Thomas Aquinas and Catherine of Siena, the foregoing would seem a fair analysis. Dominican zeal for logic, for a clear presentation of truth reached its climax in the scholar who arranged in an orderly fashion all the tenets of theology, their consequences and derivatives. And where is more evangelical zeal to be found than in St. Catherine who accompanied criminals to the place of execution, to win from them a moment of repentance!

The organization of the Order, up to the securing of official approbation, is marked by a naturalness of growth that again makes its existence seem inevitable. The first step was taken in 1206. A convent for women was started that year. In 1215 a centre was found for the men. The centre for the women was given in appreciation of the missioners' work. The donor was the orthodox Bishop of Toulouse. The missioners had greatly relieved the distress caused to the Bishop by the swarms of heretics in his diocese. Prouille (the name of the Church donated by the Bishop) was, at the start, not a convent. It was a haven for women of the better class who had abjured their errors, but who needed instruction in the right way. Gradually it became a convent. Dominic, though an active preacher, never erred in undervaluing the contemplative way of life, and he incorporated into his practice and his ideal all of the strictly cloistered observances that it was possible for him to carry out. Nine ladies went into residence in the first house built by Dominic adjacent to the church of Prouille.

The Preachers themselves, the Friars Preachers, organized themselves formally in 1216. They were seventeen in number. Long preliminary work had of course been done before that formal step became possible. The same Bishop (Toulouse) who made over Prouille for the women, established Dominic, sometime before 1214, as chaplain of the church at Fanjeaux. This gave to the men a centre of their own

for worship. A residential centre was acquired for the Preachers in 1215 by the accession to their number of a wealthy young man of Toulouse; he made over his patrimony, including a house, to Dominic. In 1215 the Bishop gave official recognition to the Preachers in his own diocese. Dominic, however, (wisely, as the sequence of events proved) did not wish the work of evangelization and its fruits to be at the mercy of a single Bishop. He was seeking the approval of Rome itself. The time seemed propitious, for the Pope had just called together a General Council one object of which should be a consideration of ways and means for improving morals, and for correcting heresy. Dominic decided to go to Rome, to declare the results of the ten years of preaching in Provence, and to obtain, he hoped, in recognition of that labour, a formal sanction for the Preachers.

But there were difficulties in the way he had not foreseen. From the year 1100 onward for a century, Religious Orders were being everywhere established. In this present series of articles, only the great Orders are studied. Smaller Orders made valuable contributions to civilization and to religious life; but in most cases they are branches growing out from a parent stem—and in some cases the branch is the result of personal idiosyncrasy. The note of personality was so strong and dangerous in the many Rules submitted by would-be Founders to the authorities at Rome, that this General Council at Rome to which Dominic went in great hope, decreed that no new Orders should be established. "For fear," the decree proceeds, "lest an exaggerated diversity of religious Rules should produce grievous confusion in the Church, we forbid that anyone whosoever shall henceforth introduce any fresh ones. He who desires to embrace the religious life may adopt one of the Rules which have already been approved. In the same way, whosoever shall wish to found a new monastic house shall make use of the Rule and the institutions of one of the recognized Orders." It was in vain that Dominic represented to this Council the self-sacrifice and sound sense of the Preachers. The Council ended its session without granting the sanction he desired, and, at the beginning of 1216, he had to return disappointed to his brethren in southern France. During that period of waiting in Rome, there occurred the incident that Fra Angelico has commemorated in painting,—the meeting of Dominic and Francis of Assisi. The story will be told in connection with St. Francis.

A legend relates that the Pope, very favorably impressed with Dominic, but unwilling to act against the decree of the Council, bade him go home and choose one of the old Rules for the proposed new Order of Preachers. This is what actually happened, though whether in the manner the legend narrates, some may doubt. The brothers assembled with Dominic. They were seventeen in all. It is easy to follow in imagination the deliberations of the seventeen brothers, to enter into their perplexity, to grope with them for a way out of the cul-de-sac of the decree. How simply does the inspiration come! It suddenly occurs

to Canon Dominic that his little company has but to adopt the Rule which he himself as Canon of Osma had already observed, namely, the indefinite, elastic Rule of St. Augustine, (the Canon's Rule). With that Rule adopted, their difficulties end, for they find themselves within the bounds mentioned in the decree of the Council. And, at the same time, that Rule is so general and elastic that it does not prohibit the special work engaged in by what is really a new Religious Order—an Order of Mendicant Preachers. Dominic went again to Rome, and in December 1216, he obtained the coveted sanction.

It is custom and courtesy that give to certain writings of St. Augustine the name "Rule." We have already said that as Bishop of Hippo, Augustine maintained a community life with his canons. He has described their mode of life in two sermons. These sermons and certain letters and treatises on the monastic life contain the *general* principles of monasticism. It was the flexibility of these principles, their adaptability to various groups of people, that made this "Rule of St. Augustine" so suitable for Canons, and so popular with founders of Orders in the 12th and 13th centuries. It was this flexibility that made possible St. Dominic's Order. He and his companions could continue their work as Preachers and Mendicant Friars, by giving a general adherence to the general recommendations of Augustine.

Five years later Dominic died—in 1221, at his prime. These five years were very busy ones. It was the period of rooting the Order in the soil of Italy, Spain, England, Northern France, and the countries to the East. That work of propagation involved visits from the Father Founder to the new centres established by his sons—journeys to many great centres.

Dominic's mature life thus forms two easy divisions. Passing over the years of preparation (to 1194) and the period of apprenticeship at the Cathedral, his life work begins in 1205 (he was then 35) with the mission to Provence. During eleven years he worked at a seed bed, forming the Order of Preachers. During five years more he transplanted his seedlings into the open.

The long sojourn in Provence terminated with the official establishment of the Preachers. It must not be inferred from what has been said of Dominic's energy and success with the Albigenses, that the heresy had been suppressed. He was energetic, prayerful and successful, but his success lay in demonstrating that the field was white and ripe for preaching rather than in converting hosts. We are following in this article the rise of the Dominican Order. We consider facts as they relate to that and not to the Albigensian sects. It must be remembered that those sects had been in existence much more than a century; that they were not confined to some country districts in the south of France, but were wide-spread, in cities, in Spain, Italy, Switzerland, Austria. From the view point of true success, Dominic must certainly be regarded as a great leader from the fact that in the course of

eleven years he gathered around him seventeen companions (some of them converts from the sectarians) willing to take the vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, and to devote their lives, under his direction, to evangelical work. Exteriorly, as the world counts success, there was not much to be placed to Dominic's credit. The mass of misbelievers were not reached by his handful of Preachers. In 1208, following the murder by the heretics of Toulouse of one of the Cistercian monks whom the Pope had commissioned for the work, the Pope called upon the King of France to suppress the sectarians and rebels. Simon de Montfort (father of the Simon noted in English History) became chief of the Expedition, and in many conflicts broke the hostile forces. But there were several recurrences of the rebellion, and Montfort was killed in one of these, in 1218. Eventually those southern earldoms and provinces were more closely attached to the northern Kingdom of France. But the heresies persisted through another century.

Dominic had no delusions in regard to his accomplishments among the heretics. He saw no possibility, by continuing to preach among them, of clearing up the situation. On the other hand, he saw that his company of Preachers could become a very effective instrument for religion. He decided therefore to extend it beyond parochial and provincial limits. Accordingly, in 1217, after his return from obtaining the Roman sanction, he assembled with his brothers, won their sympathy with his views, and sent them off into new fields and new labours. Seven went to Paris, four into Spain, four remained at Prouille and Toulouse to guide the original foundations, Dominic himself went to Rome.

Thenceforward, for five years, the history of the Order is a rapid increase of members and centres. When Dominic died, in 1221, sixty monastic houses had been established with a membership of about five hundred men and one hundred nuns. The largest of these houses were at the university centres, Paris, Bologna, Palencia (the town in Spain where Dominic had studied) and, later, Oxford.

The university towns were chosen by preference. Like Ignatius Loyola, Dominic saw that learning is a valuable instrument for combatting distorted truth and its moral consequences. His ideals and aims for his Order and individual members have much in common with the more modern Jesuit Order. Indeed, in the world today, the Dominican and Jesuit Orders are often mentioned (in contrast with contemplative Orders) as those which attract "men of parts." No small portion of Dominic's greatness is the wisdom with which he provided for the various needs of individual members and also for the varied classes of members in the Order. First of all he drew a clear line between the duties and mode of life of the monks and the nuns. The convents were to stand for the purely contemplative side of the religious life. The nuns, therefore, had no connection, or practically none, with the outside world. At Prouille, and later convents which Dominic founded or re-

formed upon the model of Prouille, the nuns were forbidden to leave the cloister, they might talk with members of their family only behind a grating, there were no visitors except those few officials (members of the Order) who directed the affairs of the convent, and these official visitors transacted the necessary duties (spiritual and temporal) behind a grating. Here is part of a letter from Dominic to a new convent at Madrid: "My desire is that in cloistered places—that is the refectory, the dormitory, and the oratory—silence shall be kept, and that in everything besides the Rule shall be observed. Let no one leave the convent; let no one enter it unless it be the bishop and the other superiors who come to preach or to visit it canonically." Again, there is this direction: "No sister shall leave the house where she has made her profession, unless she is for some necessary purpose transferred from it to another convent of the same Order." Thus, the daily life of Dominican nuns was a faithful carrying out of the old Benedictine provisions, the Divine Office at the "Hours," private prayers and reading, and manual work of spinning, weaving, etc. The nuns, by their labour could not, however, provide their own maintenance, and, as they had no contact with the world, they could not beg it; Dominic's habit was to transfer to the convents, for their upkeep, gifts of property etc., which were made to him—or to the monasteries. He wished to preserve the spirit of poverty and mendicancy, and was unwilling to retain such gifts for the Preachers who went out into the world and could beg.

The men of the Order—monks, friars, or Preachers as we may prefer to call them—represent the "active" side of the religious life. No reader of the QUARTERLY is likely to misinterpret the word "active" as does Mr. Lea, the scholar and historian quoted earlier. Commenting upon the improvement Dominic made in the older forms of monasticism, Mr. Lea writes: "It was not for them (Dominicans) to practise the strenuous idleness of conventual life, in a ceaseless round of barren liturgies." That is a great misunderstanding of Dominic's feeling. Dominic made ceaseless efforts to combine with the new duty of preaching the older duties of monastery life. His early associates testify that he attended Divine Office with them, passing from one side of the choir to the other, "exhorting them to sing with energy and devotion." He planned for the "Night Offices" just as St. Bernard had done: "As soon as they wake and rise the friars shall together recite the matins of the Blessed Virgin according to the season, and then repair to the choir." With all this strict planning, Dominic retained that fundamental elasticity which we have seen is characteristic of the Canon's Rule. He provided for individual needs: "Those suited to the office of preaching (the most important in the Order or rather in the Church of God) shall be employed in no other work. They are to be devoted to reading and study rather than to the singing of responses and anthems." This mental flexibility of Dominic's was exhibited in an amazing manner at the first general meeting of the brethren after the membership had greatly

increased. He foresaw how later adherents would be apt to follow the Rule in a literal and mechanical way; rather than countenance such idolatry of the Rule, Dominic declared "he would go to every cloister and hack them (the Rules) to pieces with his knife." That is indeed a remarkable example of detachment and impersonality!

There is a passage in one of the early records which describes Dominic at work with his books. That passage shows what St. Dominic meant by study and why, for the sake of such study, he was willing to dispense his friars from choir duties. In fact such study is but another form of prayer; it accounts for the power of their preaching. This comment upon Dominic recalls something similar we have heard or read about St. Thomas Aquinas—how he studied at the foot of his crucifix, talking with his crucifix. It makes St. Thomas's place in the Order seem natural and inevitable. The old Chronicle states: "He never entered any house where hospitality was given him without first saying a prayer in the church, if there was one in the place. When the meal was ended he retired to a chamber where he read the Gospel of St. Matthew or the Epistle of St. Paul, which he always carried about with him. He would sit down, open his book, cross himself, and then begin to read attentively. But presently he became carried away by the Divine Word. From his gestures it seemed as though he were speaking with some one; he appeared to listen, to dispute, to argue; at times he smiled or wept; he gazed straight before him, then lowered his eyes, muttered to himself and beat upon his breast. He passed incessantly from reading to prayer and from meditation to contemplation. From time to time he would press his lips lovingly to his book as though thanking it for his happiness, or bury his face in his hands or his hood and sink still deeper into his holy ecstasy."

Dominic died in 1221, just at his prime, full of plans for further evangelical work. His last years were very happy, free from the distress that so troubled his great contemporary of Assisi. He died, seeing his Order a useful and effective organization, that had not yet begun to depart from his ideals for it. That period of decay started perhaps shortly after his death, in 1227, when the Pope made the Dominicans of Tuscany responsible for the work of Inquisition against heretics. The Pope found the Dominicans faithful and effective agents, and gradually made them Inquisitors in all the European Kingdoms.

SPENCER MONTAGUE.

It is easy to make great sacrifices when God does not ask them, but to give up our own will in each detail of life is something far harder.—H. Bowman.

WHY I JOINED THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

April 30, 1917.

DEAR KATHERINE:

THE recent correspondence between us, wholly earnest and wholly honest on the side of each, has been yet one more exemplification of the law as stated by St. Paul: "All things work together for good to those that love God, who are all called according to his purpose."

The true believer in God cannot regard any page, paragraph, line, word or jot of his life writing as without significance, or bereft of an ultimate outworking for good. The meanings are not always made manifest at once nor in full, but there is a central and unbroken meaning from the beginning to the culmination.

The fact that a certain silence fell between us as to the things of the soul was not necessarily (as you have seemed to think) indicative on my part of any "loss of experience," or any spiritual lapse; nor had you any right (I say this reverently to you as my one-time teacher) to conclude definitely concerning the life of my soul, when you had no positive facts or full knowledge. Acceptance, not judgment, is the part of really scientific wisdom. Neither you nor I have the vision of omniscience, and *therefore* for *us* is spoken the law, "Judge not." When the time was ripe the silence was broken; and then my words, which broke the silence, conveyed to you that which did not conform to your personal religious convictions, and this led on your part to an earnest remonstrance against what seemed to you to be sin, or spiritual retrogression, in me.

Your remonstrance, coming when and as it did, acted upon my thoughts as a precipitant, and helped me to analyze and come to a clear understanding of my own inward state. I went to the bottom, so to speak, and brought up all my former credos for examination. Therefore I say the whole episode between you and me has been but part of the life chapter, and is not to be disregarded nor regretted, but viewed calmly and studiously and *trustfully*.

I am now led to review, as clearly as possible, the history of my life in those things which we include under the term "religious experience." Such review will be of no permanent value nor interest to any save yourself and a few of the nearest friends with whom I hold in common a fundamental belief in God as the Creator of the universe.

In view of our late correspondence in which you state your doubt as to my ever having been converted, or ever having known the Christ, I owe you this courtesy in things spiritual, the courtesy of my soul narrative so far as I can tell it; and, to go deeper yet, owe to you this

story for the reason that you were for very long my revered teacher as I pursued the way that leads to everlasting life. You teach me still, for the power of a truly illumined soul never dies.

I cannot remember when a certain consciousness of God was not mine, and my memory runs back very clearly to some time before my sixth year. There was always within me a certain instinctive readiness to pray; not so much formal petition as that *look* toward God which may be compared to the glances which a little child continually turns toward the father near whom it may be walking or playing. I believe I was born His child, a naughty one very often, but always conscious of my Parentage.

That consciousness of God flashed out in hours of fear, tenderness and in contemplation of Nature. If I were "afraid in the dark," or in a storm, or in an empty room, or of losing my mother, my baby soul always turned to God in this upward glance which is perhaps truest prayer. When this same baby soul was given a gift or a caress, the reaction *always* was a swelling desire and resolution to be "good," rising with such emotion as to cause genuine pain. Everything in Nature was dearer to that little child than anything else in the outward world. Born and reared in a large city, she worshipped before the curb-grown dandelion, the one far star beyond the city roof, the narrow glimpses of sky, the smell of rain-wet air. Mother, for very peace's sake, often yielded to my passionate clamors and took me by boat or car to the green fields and riverside, mourning because I loved Mother Earth so well that I could never forego direct contact, and had to be led home a very untidy child. She did not know what I then felt, later knew, and now more clearly understand—an understanding that is to deepen—that the dandelion has a livingness which *my livingness greeted,* the wind has a voice and a being, the stars were other than just stars, the rain something more than mere water. Everything in Nature was precious and alive, and I could not not-believe in a Life all around me, although I could not see it with my eye of flesh. This communion with Nature has grown with my growth, and if it be "pantheism," with which you have charged me (a doctrine I know only by its word-derivation, by sporadic literary allusions, and by your mention of it in our correspondence), then I was born pantheist, and give reverent thanks for that which has been one of the richest phases of my life on earth!

So much for the child's natural religion, or better her religious nature.

My mother was an Episcopalian, a communicant of the Church of England; and through sermons, from the prayer book, from such writers as Milton, from a study of the Bible that plunged an immature mind into subjects too high and deep, I gathered beliefs in a devil and all his angels, an angry and insulted God, a Savior who must needs be crucified for my sins (though I could not intelligently understand what *I* personally and

individually had to do with things that happened before I was born!); of a hell where people were tortured forever. Whenever I saw I was in danger, I speedily tried to square accounts with the Most High and it was a relief, when the danger was over, to settle down again into natural habits of the mind and heart. I promised under fear to "be good."

I was at times "a good girl," and at other times "a bad girl," but now from the perspective afforded by over fifty years, I *know* that deep within myself (*unbroken from the beginning*) was that which it is difficult to frame in words, but impossible not clearly to perceive as a *consciousness of God* and His Christ. The Methodist Church calls this "conviction:" well, then, I was "convinced" of God; has called it "hunger for God:" well, then, I was hungry and also feeding on the eternal bread, for had I not been so feeding, that unsatisfied hunger in me must have resulted in the starvation of that me which hungered. The Bible calls that consciousness of God—"the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world:" well, then, that "light" has burned in me always, and through a life of strange vicissitudes, temporal and spiritual, I have *always been conscious of its presence.*

I know that my history is not unlike any other history of this nature, save as one face is unlike every other face, and so all faces are unlike; yet so great is our calling and election that each individual's history counts eternally.

I came along through the first seven and the second seven years of my life, as I suppose all girls do, dreaming dreams. Through all dreams and fears ran this deep urging and longing to be "good." Only one type of friend or companion ever deeply satisfied me, namely, an individual with a soul purpose, a central earnestness of some kind. I could romp and laugh with the wildest; but a strain of music, the breath of a flower, a hint of earnestness in conversation, and that central hunger within me was all attention.

It became time for my confirmation in the Church of England. A deep sense of solemnity was all mixed up with pride in the flowing veil and other outward novelties of the occasion. Somehow I gathered the idea that when the Bishop's hands were laid upon my head, something in me would change and after that I should have no trouble in being as "good" as possible. To my dismay, while kneeling at the altar, I discovered that the Bishop had blessed me and passed on while I was anxiously peeking around to see if a blue-eyed boy in the choir had noticed my beautiful veil! My fourteen-year-old mind was perplexed that so terrible a thing could happen, and I nearly came to the conclusion that I was not one of the elect. I transferred my hope for escape from inherent naughtiness to the hour of my first communion, and recall very vividly the horror with which I awakened soon afterward to the fact that I was *the same girl that I had been before.* Discouraged and dismayed, I nevertheless followed the light, or rather it wooed me by its Holy Shining.

When I was about eighteen years old I heard a sermon that colored all the subsequent current of my life. The preacher was a Methodist, one of the last exponents of that fervent Wesleyan spirit that resembled the spirit of the ancient prophets. He was a man of culture and of deep vision. He avoided the easy religious verbiage that refers lightly to things holy and tremendous. As I listened to his sermon I knew that I was hearing of something vital, as I had never heard of it before, and my whole being said, "This is what I have been looking for."

At the close of the sermon he asked if there were any in the house who desired to know more of this religion and who wished the prayer of God's people. If there were such, would they stand up? This was the first time I had ever been in any but an Episcopal Church, and the whole thing was against my natural inclinations. Shy, intensely self-conscious, afraid of publicity, sick with inward trembling, yet there seemed for me no other honest response to the honest appeal than to stand on my feet. No one else stood.

Later that day some one who knew what I had done assured me that I had misunderstood the preacher; that I was *a Christian because I had been confirmed;* that I was simply "muddled," and that she had a book at home that would straighten me out and comfort me. The book was Hannah Whitall Smith's *Christian's Secret of a Happy Life.* I read it and was more wretched than ever before, because Hannah Smith pointed out very clearly that for which I was looking, the secret of being "a good girl," the secret of a God-obeying life. I wanted to be and I felt that all people ought to be as holy as St. Paul. By that act of standing in the church I was classed by observers either as "convicted" or "converted." I know now that *neither of these terms covered the case:* I was simply doing what I had always been doing, feeling after God. Could I only then have understood that *from the beginning He had been in my soul*—with my soul—why, I dare now to state the wider truth!—WAS HIMSELF MY REAL SELF, how I might have grown in grace and in the knowledge of God! Yet even as I write this last sentence I am recalled by knowledge of the law forever operative: "All things work together for good to them that love God, who are the called according to His purpose." I was led in the way that was the Way for me.

In all these events I was in the path of evolution. For some part in that evolutionary progress and Divine purpose, I was led in the way in which I was led, and do not now regret any of the way.

One only of all the sermons I heard this saint preach can I recall, and of that only the central theme; and now, at the age of fifty-five, that burning message flashes clear: "The Kingdom of God *is within you.* The Word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and *in thine heart.*" Did I know the meaning? No, but the truth the preacher proclaimed was as a seed dropped in good soil to germinate when its own season was ripe, and not before. He quoted David, and I can still hear the bigness of his voice vibrant with the truth which it carried. "Though I make

my bed in hell, Thou art there." Did I know the meaning? No; but I *felt* the truth, and feeling was to grow to certain knowledge. Dimly I used to reason this way: since God abides in "heaven" and equally abides in "hell," how then can one be different from the other or less good for man than the other? My thinking was as blind as the movements of a blind kitten that moves its head about feeling for a somewhere. Its going, or movement is a content of somewhere to go. So I felt the oneness of God and sensed His permeation of the *all* which He has created out from Himself. I dared not yet disbelieve in the hell of theology, for I felt there must be some means of disposition of the naughty ones. I felt the incompleteness of its teachings but had no better teaching. I was always sure the Sinners would come home to heaven *if they could only understand*, and I wanted to believe that some day they would understand. Now I am sure of this!

A certain urge within me, a certain certainty about God and His Christ, opened my lips in public so that I became by turn Sunday School teacher, class and prayer-meeting leader. I suffered fearfully from nervous tremors whenever I spoke or taught; but I rarely could refuse an opportunity to "say so," lest I be counted as not "on the Lord's side." I wanted to do this work—I never could refrain; yet I was never perfectly sure of the singleness of my own motives.

My whole religious life was one of ups and downs. Some said I was vacillating, others said I was moody. There were no doubt these qualities present; but there were also others. I always had a *hungry mind*. Sometimes a flash of truth would gleam across my mind, and after it my spirit would inevitably follow. Great conflict there always was, caused, as I now know, by the doctrines I so earnestly tried to understand and accept. Some of these doctrines were: the inherent sinfulness of man; eternal punishment; the vicarious atonement; the gift of the Holy Ghost, called by many Methodists "the second blessing." I *wondered* reverently about the resurrection of the body and rested my doubts on a belief that He who had performed miracles on earth, no doubt could re-assemble the dissipated parts of my body and somehow join thereto my soul. Theology did not scientifically or satisfactorily bridge the gaps for me.

In revival meeting when I was told that the conversion and therefore the salvation of individuals depended on me and that therefore I must "go after souls," I was torn between my desire to do right, with a deep repugnance at any attempt to unveil the secret retirement of another's soul, and a feeling I could not explain—that such methods were somehow unwise. I used to argue to myself in this way: "If the Almighty God made Mary Jones's chance of heaven rest on my obedience to Preacher Smith's call to me on some particular evening to 'go after' Mary's soul, then somehow God was not so Almighty as I felt Him to be and as He should be! Moreover, if *any one's* ULTIMATE salvation depended on my poor prayers and my "love for souls," why on earth was it that I could

NOT make myself pray all night long and wrestle that soul into heaven? Why should my weariness or my human indifference condemn another to eternal death? I understand better now!

So the vicious circle of unreasonable doctrines held up before a reasonable mind kept me blundering along, stumbling, now swiftly and now with lagging steps, after "holiness."

It would be interesting (to me) to go exhaustively into the psychology of all those years. Suffice it to say that all the while there lived within me that central Light so that whenever a crisis came in outward events, the Light blazed up and my soul somehow saw and followed. Was I in need? I felt that God would provide, and He never failed. Was I in danger? I felt sure of His care here and hereafter. I got hold of the truth that "there shall no harm befall thy dwelling place," and that my dwelling place was in the eternal God.

When the supreme love of my life came to me it came in such guise as to help me see yet more clearly that light within. When my husband and always lover passed on, I received my *first absolute knowledge within myself* that life is continuous and that the spirit leaves the body with all its functions unimpaired. Nevertheless my heart knew its Gethsemane of human desolation and perhaps because there was no other way, a vision was granted me and I saw with or despite the eyes of flesh my beloved and The Beloved, heard a *spoken promise of future care,* and no yawning mouth of hell nor any radiant angel can make me unsee Those whom I saw, nor forget or disbelieve in their message of love. *And they have kept the word that was spoken to me that June day,* 1905.

I may say here that I am no spiritualist and no seer of visions. This *one* vision was *mine* in my hour of need as supremely and as really as was the vision granted to Saint Paul.

After my husband "went away" I desired more than ever to purify life and spirit and more than ever I sought, as I had so often sought before, for the definite gift of the Holy Ghost, the baptism by fire such as came at Pentecost, "the second blessing." I was sure that unless such sanctifying by fire were mine I could not live the life which I believed the Bible calls upon men to live: a perfectly unselfish, pure life; a life of spiritual power; a life of faith as far as temporal needs are concerned; a life of prayer and meditation and service. Christ said: "Be ye perfect as your Father in Heaven is perfect." *I have never known any better than to believe that He meant what He said, but I thought that He spoke that word to every one who should read it or hear it.* He also said, "Preach the Gospel to every creature." I was sure that He spoke that word to me. The secret, then, of attaining this life to which He called me seemed to be the baptism of the Holy Spirit. I many times before had sought this baptism. Certain leaders had assured me that if I "believed" I should "receive." I went so far in my confidence in those leaders as to affirm "on faith" that I had entered into such an experience; but each time followed the discovery that I still remained normally human.

However, once more I sought; and I made a bargain with my God, saying in effect: "If Thou wilt grant me the gift of the Holy Ghost, I will preach the Gospel while I live." I was as honest when I said those words as I was when I kissed the lips of my dying husband in good-by.

A great peace fell upon my soul. Somewhere I had heard this: "Act as if I were and thou shalt know that I am." So I went about my days, *holding my mind in the attitude of belief* that I had received the Holy Ghost as the answer to my belief; therefore I must preach the Gospel and live wholly by faith. I gave up an excellent position and began to follow my husband's evangelistic methods of work. Conscientiously from day to day I followed what seemed to be the Spirit's voice, and the leading took me into enough preaching to show me that I was no preacher—or at least to show me that if I ever *were* to preach worthily and helpfully, I needed a new and full course of preparation. Yet I would not give up. I faithfully followed from day to day what seemed to me to be the directing voice of the Spirit, and the earthly path led me into the country in the State of Tennessee and there so far as preaching the Gospel was concerned, I was as one shut up in the belly of the whale.

It was at this time that you secured the editorial position for me in England and I was sure that the Spirit was leading me to my goal, for the journal on whose staff I was to serve was a holiness organ and I was to have the privilege of a course of Bible training under gifted leaders. A few days before I was to sail, as you know, I was carried on a stretcher to the hospital and lay there for weeks helpless and suffering. I had sold my home; and when I was able to leave the hospital I was without money, without strength, stripped of every human comfort. All was gone save the inner Light that never ceased to assure me. Through those awful days of trial it turned its concentrated rays on Paul's word: "I know that all things work together for good to them that love God, who are the called according to His purpose."

Shall I say that I clung to that truth, or that the truth from that hour abode increasingly with me? Yet you have told me that you doubt if I was ever really converted or ever really knew my Master. As well you might tell me, who have had good eyes for fifty-five years, that I have been blind all these years!

Following that illness I experienced everything save actual starvation; but always I knew Him in Whom I believed and He kept that which I had committed unto Him.

Do not misunderstand me. I am not for one instant telling a story *of my own righteousness.* Too well I know that I was and am abominably human. I did and said and thought things which saints do not do and say and think; but I know now that I was, as I am still, *evolving, developing, growing naturally* toward that far-distant Sainthood and was never once out of my Master's hands or out of the direct path of evolution. True sainthood is a matter not of one life but is the crowning of many incarnations.

Without money or strength I was called to go to M————. You began then to doubt that I was doing right and wrote me to fight for my spiritual life and "the keen edge of my spiritual experience." I listened to your words because I knew you to be, as you are, God's own—peculiarly so. But even to you I could not say that I was what I was not, and my letters to you could *not* give the history of an *ecstasy* which I did not feel. I was not then spending hours of each day in prayer and Bible study as I did in E————. I was doing the rough, hard work of a pioneer woman on the bare plains. I was not preaching but I was learning; getting close to Nature in a vision of her wonders never before dreamed of. I was enduring heat and cold, doing rough, hard work, learning the lesson sent me by the Lord of Life. Dare any one say I was not to learn those lessons, that because I was learning them I was a backslider or fallen from grace? Shall one not learn all the lessons?

After being in M———— for a year and a half with my friend M., I left her and took up a claim for myself and lived there—with no near neighbors, practically no money, and no companionship. There for the better part of three years I lived entirely alone. Did I *keep* the Sabbath? Not exactly. In a certain sense all seven days were alike. Did I pray? Sometimes, as *you* define prayer; always, as I knew it in my own soul. While there alone with the daily companionship of the majestic Rockies, with a door-yard one hundred and fifty miles across, with a stupendous panorama of wonder and beauty, with unbroken silence around me almost all of twenty-four hours, I found a great change going on within. One by one the dogmas of the Church dropped away, and I made the discovery that a lot of my religion lay in or was dependent on outward forms and fellowships. Severed from Church and Church members, without Christian comrades, with no outward religious duties, I came at last to look upon my naked soul, to realize what I really believed for myself and what I was letting others believe for me. And one night I went out under the silent stars and looking up, said, *"I believe in You!"* I said it over and over again, for it seemed to me that I should die of my soul nakedness. Everything imposed upon my thought by men and books was stripped away. Later on I even found myself wondering: "Who and what is this God in whom I cannot but believe?" The heavenly throne and the bottomless hell were gone alike, and nothing was left save the Eternal *One*.

It is very difficult to put the thought processes of this time into words but I can perhaps make myself clear by some concrete statements. The one decision to which I came was that I should never again label as wrong any overt act the springs of which I could not know as clearly as God can know them. If I saw a man smoke or drink, I must leave him with his Maker, ready, of course, to do my part if the man himself opened the way, by witnessing to him of what I believe to be better methods of life. If a woman went to the theatre—I myself might even go; for never having attended any worldly amusements of the kind, how should

I say what was right or wrong for me or any one else? In other words, I awakened to the fact that much of my so-called religion was a *belief in certain sayings of others* and a credulous following of certain *authoritative* doctrines. My outward life was conformed to ideals laid down by other people. I decided to find out intelligently and for myself what are matters of right and wrong, to live my life in my own way, to be, as far as possible, a normal woman, acting from intelligent understanding instead of from *blind* faith. I determined not to be afraid to say "I do not know" about anything, and never to say "I believe" because some one else—even though he were a bishop—said to me "This is so."

While visiting a friend in M———— just before I came to S————, she made the statement (I cannot give her exact words) to the effect that the central being of each individual is pure spirit. I said to her, *"Do you mean to tell me that there is a place in me or a part of me that is without sin?"* And as she dried the dish that was in her hand, she said almost casually, as if all the world knew it except myself, "Why, of course. Pure spirit is pure, is it not? At the center, you are pure spirit!"

It seemed to me that that moment a chain that had bound my soul as long as I could remember, was broken and cast aside, and *I stood up straight* as every child of God should stand, in the conscious dignity of my Divine inheritance—of the Divine Ego which just now bears the name of A—— S——.

This friend it was who put into my hands later the Dorè lectures by Judge Troward, and he showed me that I am one with the Divine and that I may so develop my Divine Spirit as to fulfil in some life to come that word of Christ's: "Be ye perfect as your Father in Heaven is perfect."

In the past I have had moments of rapture and of ecstasy; but never before was it my blessed privilege to draw the satisfying soul breaths that I drew as I took this big truth into my mind. Shortly after this I came to S———— and entered upon a more normal life, as far as this world is concerned, than in any previous years. I even went to the theatre and experienced no sense of condemnation. That I do not attend amusements every night in the week is due to my own choice and sense, not due to any outside word of authority. That is to say, I have reached the place of a more intelligent recognition of my central *Self,* and my hand is now the directing lever of my life, as it should be. I try to judge no one. I ASK THAT NO ONE JUDGE ME. I endeavor to walk by the Light within *as I see it.*

Two years ago I came into very close relations with a young woman in whom I saw a spirit at once reverent and just; a mind cultured and clear; and I ventured now and then to put to her some leading questions.

Your letters so severely arraigning me and warning me of wrath to come, drove me to severe self-examination; and in the suffering induced by what you wrote, I talked with my friend who gave me answers from

her heart, answers which always threw me back, as far as accepting them was concerned, upon my own intelligence. She told me not to be afraid to analyze any truth and *not to lean on any one*. She began to talk to me of evolution and I wondered why it was that through all the years I had been steered so far from the evolutionary theory. She spoke to me of the doctrine of reincarnation and I found my mind strangely ready to take it in. She gave me books to read, urging me always never to accept a truth that I did not see for myself. She told me, moreover, that I would be able to put to the proof sooner or later every truth by which my life is steered. Troward's books had prepared the way for these things by revealing to me the truth that I am one with Him—that I am essentially Divine; that the Divine powers are unfolded in the Ego within, even as the perfect oak tree and all its acorns are unfolded in the one small nut. As Christ was, so shall I become, when the Ego within shall have evolved even as did the Master's.

With another friend, who by a very different path had arrived at the same conclusions as myself touching orthodox belief, I read the books given me. We asked for more, discussed, thought, meditated; and in time each of us independently of the other, was ready to embrace the teachings of Theosophy. We find that these teachings crown all that is past. They belittle nothing. They illumine.

I understand now that this life of mine—this Divine Ego enshrined within my body, has always been; that I have been evolving since the beginning; that I have been under the guidance of great human *teachers* who long ago reached that to which I attain—that I am a much older Ego than some individuals with whom I am associated, and a much younger Ego than others; that the events of my present life are concrete results of past events; that today's events create or determine the events of my lives to come.

Theosophy bridges the gaps, illumines the dark places, changes faith to knowledge, lends a dignity, furnishes a splendor and certainty, to life, which I always felt life should have. Theosophy is "the wisdom of God," a wisdom which is to be evolved in me.

The theosophical teaching meant so much to me that when an opportunity came to attend the Convention of The Theosophical Society in New York City, I felt it my solemn duty to embrace that opportunity, and I am concluding this sketch on the day following the Convention.

Full well I know that you for whom this very incomplete story is written, and perhaps some others to whom I shall give it, will think me led far astray. One of the cardinal teachings of Theosophy is that every man must be permitted to hold his independent beliefs; that one must never indulge in criticism. One of the leaders said to me yesterday, a man who holds a responsible position in the University, "If Theosophy does not illumine the real religion of an individual, whatever that religion be, then that which he takes for Theosophy is something else. Theosophy is not a creed, it is rather a light."

And I say unto you, honored friend, and to any one who may read this imperfect story, that Theosophy has restored to me a faith that threatened to go out, has given me a sweetness of spirit, a tolerance, a clearness of vision, a patience with life, a sense of Divine justice, a hope for all mankind, *which I never had before.* It has given me back my belief in the Bible, or, rather, has *illuminated* a Book that had become dulled through many misinterpretations and misconceptions. It has *made Christ real* to me as never before. It has lifted up and broadened out and immeasurably strengthened my determination to follow Him. It has given me purpose and reason. It has shown me how I can, in time, attain even unto that command, "Be ye perfect, even as your Father in Heaven is perfect."

My mind, built by God, is being increasingly satisfied. My years, now nearing three score, are to be rich and growing and splendid and I freely say unto you, I am content, and I go forward.

A. M. S.

P. S. The foregoing was written in the warm afterglow of the Convention of The Theosophical Society, held in New York City, last May. Eight months of close study and clean-cut spiritual decisions confirm all I have written—and more. Devoutly I affirm that the Master has become and is steadily becoming more real to me; that the Bible unfolds as I never dared dream it could unfold, in a revelation of hitherto hidden truth and glory; that all endeavor to "be good" has a scientific basis and an assured goal. I am more than "content": I am profoundly and devoutly grateful and am resolved still to go forward.

A. M. S.

Write your name in kindness, love, and mercy on the hearts of those you come in contact with year by year.—Chalmers.

FROM THE HIGHLANDS OF LEMURIA

IV

Lemuro-Atlantean Astronomy

IN one of the earlier chapters of this study of Lemurian and Atlantean remains, we saw that, widely dispersed over the whole Polynesian area which includes much of the Lost Lemuria, there are traditions of a graded series of heavens and hells, completely corresponding to the teaching of ancient India concerning the Lokas, or, as we may prefer to call them, the higher and lower planes of spiritual life. And these ancient fragments of what we must call the Lemurian Secret Doctrine are to all intents and purposes identical, in islands separated by wide ocean spaces of thousands of miles; further, they have been preserved unchanged during a period so long that immense and fundamental differences have developed between languages which must once have been a common tongue: differences the nature and meaning of which we tried to make clear in another chapter. The result we arrived at was, that the original Lemurian tongue must have been a language almost wholly made up of vowel sounds; that consonants, or contacts, had been gradually developed, through cycles of progressive materialization; and that, in view of their comparative poverty in consonants or contacts—as compared with a rich consonant range like that of Sanskrit—this whole group of Polynesian or Lemurian languages belong to a very early period in the history of mankind, a period that may well be millions of years ago. And, since it appeared that, while the different groups of Polynesian islanders—descendants of the Lemurians—had seemingly been separated during the long epochs when their languages were developing in different directions, (for, had these languages come in contact with each other, they would have been blended or blurred, instead of showing clean-cut phonetic differences), while at the same time they possessed identical teachings concerning the spiritual planes or worlds, with names for them that, beneath their long and slowly developed phonetic divergences, were identical; it seemed certain that they had all possessed the same teaching concerning the spiritual worlds while they were still undivided, that is, while Lemuria was a continuous continent, not a vast, far thrown galaxy of islands and archipelagos.

If this inference be correct, two things would seem to follow from it: First, that that period of common possession of this great spiritual teaching was almost inconceivably remote, belonging to the time of undivided Lemuria; and, second, that the Lemurians of that day, or some of them, were in possession of faculties of spiritual vision which we are accustomed to associate with the Adepts.

For there is only one way to gain certain and methodical knowledge of the spiritual worlds, ascending spiritual planes, or successive "heavens," whichever we may choose to call them; and that is, by developing successively the consciousness which corresponds to them; in fact by being born into one ascending plane after another; by taking each of these mansions of the Kingdom of Heaven by violence. And it is just this successive series of spiritual attainments which is called the cycle of adeptship, while the successive efforts of attainment, the successive conquests of the spiritual worlds, are the great Initiations.

The conclusion from our facts would seem to be, then, that some at least of the Lemurians were Initiates; that the great Initiations were a spiritual possession of these Lemurian Initiates, at a period almost inconceivably remote; and that the Polynesian teachings concerning the successive heavens and hells are, in fact, memories and traditions of the great Initiations, memories which still linger with striking uniformity and completeness in islands thousands of miles apart, whose inhabitants were wholly unknown to each other until modern voyagers established a new connection between them.

Since these chapters of our Lemuro-Atlantean studies were published, we had the good fortune to receive, through the thoughtful kindness of Dr. Archibald Keightley, an essay by Mr. Samuel Stuart, which strikingly corroborates these conclusions; all the more because Mr. Stuart is dealing with a wholly different subject, namely, astronomical cycles, and is only indirectly concerned with the Lemuro-Atlanteans. Probably, the best way to cover the subject will be, to quote at some length from Mr. Stuart's valuable paper, and then to indicate, very briefly, how his conclusions are related with our own. Mr. Stuart begins with an acute analysis of astronomical cycles, as recorded in the works of certain ancient nations which paid particular attention to astronomy, and he then proceeds to examine one great cycle in particular: the cycle of 4,320,000 years, which, in the ancient Indian system, is called the Maha Yuga, or Great Cycle. In India, there were a number of cycles based upon the same figures, and these were divided into dependent cycles; for example, the fourfold group of Yugas: Satya Yuga, Dvapara Yuga, Treta Yuga and Kali Yuga, the last meaning literally "the Age of the Devil," the first 5,000 years of which were completed a few years ago.

Speaking of this cycle, 432 followed by ciphers, Mr. Stuart says:

"It is remarkable that what remains we possess of the Mexican astronomy, whilst differing in their application, are yet founded upon the very same numbers as the ancient systems of India, Egypt, and Chaldea; and yet these are not such as we have derived from the heavens, and, therefore, cannot be considered as inevitable results of observation. Niebuhr remarks that the Etrurian mode of determining time was extremely accurate, and based on the same principles as the computation observed by the ancient Mexicans. 'When the Spaniards first arrived in America they found that their time, according to the Julian, was eleven

days in advance of the Mexican time, and the Mexican year at that period, it is said, differed only two minutes and nine seconds from the present estimated European year. A day consisted of sixteen hours, a week of five days, a month of twenty days, a year of eighteen months, making 360 days, to which five days or a week was added to complete the year. At the end of every 52 years an intercalation of 12½ days was made.'[1] We may here note that a day contained 86,400 seconds, and a week of their reckoning would amount to 432,000 seconds. And if we take their period of 52 years as corresponding to an hour, in 24 of these there will be 1,248 years of 365 days, with a correction of 432,000 minutes to add in order to make the same number of their solar or tropical years; which according to the foregoing 52 year cycle would be of 365d. 5h. 46m. 9.23076s. each. The peculiarity of this number 432,000, and a desire to retain it in their computations, was no doubt the reason why they used a period of 52 years, which involves a correction not composed of whole days as we find it in the old world. To make the correction amount to whole days, they would have used a period of 104 years with a difference of 25 days. But let us take ten periods of 1,248 years, when the correction becomes 4,320,000 minutes or 3,000 days; if we then multiply all by 3, we obtain 37,440 years of 365 days each, with 1,296,000 minutes, or 9,000 days, or 25 years of 360 days, added. It hence appears that the 25 *days* of the Mexican 104 year cycle, when they are multiplied by the Eastern 360, become 25 *years* of the greater cycle, in which the number of minutes added are equal to the seconds in ten circles.

"The extraordinary coincidence of the numbers employed by the Mexicans and by the eastern nations cannot have arisen accidentally, for in the Greek mythology there is a curious story of the year of 360 days, its division by 18, and the deriviation of the odd five days,[2] which seems very like a version of the Mexican rules. Moreover the number 432 and cyphers is the most ancient we possess, and appears to have been known to the eastern nations from an immemorial antiquity; it is the basis of the list of the Chaldean kings given by Berosus (third century B. C.) and of all the cycles used in India; and as we shall further see, is the most wonderful monument of ancient astronomical achievement we possess. Such strange agreements in the astronomical numbers used in the East and West, when there would appear to have been no connection between the old and the new worlds prior to Columbus, is a very strong argument in favor of the theory that there was once a time when they were in communication with each other; or if not that, then the Hindus, Egyptians and Mexicans must have had a common origin for their knowledge. And it is here that the theosophical hypothesis as to the former existence of a great continent where now rolls the Atlantic Ocean, and which joined together the peoples of the East and the West

---

[1] Wilson's *Lost Solar System of the Ancients Discovered*, II., 160, 314, 335.

[2] Sir Wm. Drummond's *Oedipus Judaeicus*, 103.

and made their knowledge have a common resemblance, will supply the link which is necessary to account for the latter. . . ."

After a minute and very careful criticism of the astronomical calculations of the motions of the planets, and the amounts by which these calculations may depart from absolute accuracy, Mr. Stuart comes to the immediate study of the cycle of 4,320,000 years, the Maha Yuga, or Great Cycle. He believes it to be a cycle of this nature: At some immensely remote period in the past, there was a conjunction of all the planets (namely, Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus and Neptune, with, perhaps, other planets as yet unknown to modern astronomy) with the sun; all these bodies being gathered together at the same point in the heavens; or, let us say, close to the same fixed star in the Zodiac. From that point, they then set forth on their circling paths, in orbital periods of immensely varying length, from the few weeks in which Mercury traverses his small orbit round the sun, to the centuries in which remote Neptune makes the same circuit. After the lapse of how many years, how many centuries, thousands, or even millions of years, will the planets all return to the same point in the sky—the same fixed star in the Zodiac, coming once more into general conjunction with each other and with the sun? The period, according to Mr. Stuart's reasoning, is precisely the Maha Yuga of 4,320,000 years. That part of Mr. Stuart's essay which justifies this exceedingly interesting conclusion is as follows:

"We have then to be guided by the following conditions of our enquiry:

"(*a*) We are not justified in assuming that the number 4,320,000 has been quoted otherwise than exactly, unless it shall be found impossible to accomodate the mean motions of the planets to it without alterations which amount to more than five or six seconds in a century; which are the limits of accuracy assumed for our present astronomical elements.

"(*b*) Since all the planets must return to the same place amongst the stars, it follows that the period must be an exact number of sidereal solar years without any remainder.

"(*c*) Because the processional motion of the equinoxes to be used with the Maha Yuga has been definitely adopted, therefore the difference between the sidereal and Julian years in the great cycle is also known, and cannot be altered without changing all the conditions.

"(*d*) Whatever may be the number of Julian years which we have to add to the 4,320,000 sidereal years according to the given precession, the same should be the amount necessary to bring the planets into their nearest approach to a general congress according to such tabular results as we may find it best to adopt.

"(*e*) As the period known as the Maha Yuga appears to have been derived by means with which we are not acquainted, it may include planets which were unknown to us until the last century and a quarter, such as Uranus and Neptune, and may also have dealt with others yet to be discovered. We must therefore expect that Uranus and Neptune are

to be included, and that we have here another reason for the extreme length of the period; since the more planets it includes, the longer it must be.

"(*f*) We must also decide, if possible, to what age of the world the great period more particularly belonged; because according to what has been said in the foregoing, the mean motions of the planets may have been different in a remote epoch in the past, from what we find them today. As we have seen, the period in one of its varieties was quoted by Berosus about the third century B. C.; but according to Madame Blavatsky the Maha Yuga and other great periods have come down to us from Atlantean times.[1] This could not have been less than four or five million years ago.[2]

"These things premised, and taking the mean motion of the sun corresponding to the tropical years as we have found it from a comparison of Delambre and Leverrier in the foregoing, with precession for 25,920 years, we find that 4,320,000 sidereal years are equal to 4,320,074 Julian years and 252 days; which is a difference of 27.280 days, or 74.6900 years, due to the excess of one kind of years over the other. The number of tropical years would be 4,320,166.7500; since the sidereal period includes 166.75 periods of the equinox.

"We then find upon trial by our best modern tables, that whereas, the period of 4,320,000 if considered to consist of Julian or tropical years would not be a planetary period, yet when it is dealt with as sidereal years and the above difference of 74.6900 added, the motions of all the planets, including Uranus and Neptune, are so nearly equal as to bring them into positions which only differ from the point of conjunctions by an extreme difference which is about one-fifth of the ecliptic. After making all due allowance for the variations discussed in the preceding notes, it therefore appears that the claim as to the Maha Yuga being a cycle of planetary conjunctions is substantially true. And this not only for planets which we know were discovered by the ancients, but also including Uranus and Neptune, supposed to be quite unknown to them.

"But the quantities by which the planetary positions differ from the mean places they ought to occupy, show that the negative quantities are a little in excess of the positive; indicating that their mean motions were somewhat slower than at the present time. If the foregoing reasoning has been correct, this means that the sun was, in the Atlantean period, rather nearer to the body about which it revolves than at present; and consequently the planetary periods were longer and their orbits dilated. And in order to compare the result with modern data, we may (seeing they differ but little) take an average of the precession in 100 Julian years according to Leverrier and Newcomb; and after reducing the planetary tropical motions per century, given by these and Dr. Hill, to sidereal

---

[1] *The Secret Doctrine*, ii, 51-2; cf. *Isis Unveiled*, i, 239, as to late discoveries.

[2] See the author's article, "The Great Year of the Ancients," in the *Theosophist*, Jan., 1901, 222, and Feb., 297.

places according to the precession for 25,920 years, we find the differences of the Maha Yuga data are in 100 years:

Neptune	(per	Newcomb)	minus	5.481″
Uranus	”	”	plus	2.520
Saturn	”	Leverier	plus	5.589
Jupiter	”	Dr. Hill	plus	3.019
Mars	”	Newcomb	plus	4.519
Venus	”	”	minus	1.787
Sun	”	”	minus	5.334
Mercury	”	”	plus	4.559

"This is after adding the small quantity 2.641″ to the Maha Yuga results, which appears to be the amount by which the planetary centennial means motions were slower some four and a half million years ago than they are at present. We then find that, allowing all the planets to be exactly upon the place of any given fixed star or immovable point in the heavens at any given epoch, modern tables show that after a lapse of 4,320,000 sidereal years, or 4,320,074 Julian years and 252 days, the planets would differ from such a point by:

Neptune (Newcomb)	plus 65.8	(Heliocentric longitudes only).
Uranus ”	minus 30.2	
Saturn (Leverrier)	minus 67.7	
Jupiter (Dr. Hill)	minus 36.2	
Mars (Newcomb)	minus 54.2	
Sun ”	plus 94.0	
Venus ”	plus 21.5	
Mercury ”	minus 54.7	

"As none of the outstanding quantities differ from the average place required by so much as a fifth part of the ecliptic, and the outstanding errors of the tables, or unknown secular equations, may be responsible for nearly the whole of these differences, it becomes practically certain that the Maha Yuga is at least as correct as any of our means of computing, and therefore that it is a veritable cycle of the planetary motions—nay, that it is so much superior to anything which we could produce, that only within the last ten years could we completely verify it, and demonstrate that its exact length has been truly given.

"Allowing for the difference of the centennial precession by the Maha Yuga, and an average of that used by Leverrier and Newcomb (24.152″), we then have the following centennial mean sidereal motions:

Neptune	218°	28′	16.450″	and	Newcomb	(*plus*	24.152″)	gives	it	as	218°	28′ 24.572″
Uranus	68	30	33.311,	“	“	“	“	“	“		68	30 33.432
Saturn	142	7	13.821,	“	Leverrier	“	“	“	“		142	7 10.873
Jupiter	154	54	48.480,	“	Dr. Hill	“	“	“	“		154	54 48.102
Mars	60	18	38.650,	“	Newcomb	“	“	“	“		60	18 36.772
Sun	359	22	39.377,	“	“	“	“	“	“		359	22 47.352
Venus	197	49	18.043,	“	“	“	“	“	“		197	49 22.472
Mercury	72	40	57.000,	“	“	“	“	“	“		72	40 55.082

"To the Maha Yuga results we have to add 2.641", as per foregoing, when the outstanding differences will be found as above given.

"The average procession per century by a mean of Leverrier and Newcomb is 1° 23′ 44.065". If we calculate by the Maha Yuga results we shall find that the following would be the heliocentric longitudes on the completion of the cycle:

Neptune	1°	37′	These according to sidereal places.
Uranus	1	47	
Saturn	359	38	
Jupiter	359	15	
Mars	359	26	
Sun	0	0	
Venus	2	3	
Mercury	359	56	

"The preceding positions and data are all exceedingly striking and they agree very much more closely than could, under all the circumstances, be expected; while the assignable limits of error show that the last results may be quite accurate. And even if it could be satisfactorily shown that the future corrections to the planetary motions would be in the opposite directions to the above outstanding differences, this would not help objectors to the theory that the Maha Yuga is correct, out of the difficulty very far; for the synodic periods derivable from it would still be far more accurate than any we possessed prior to the year 1820—and there would also remain the greater probability in favor of the conjunction rather than against it. These things being so, the enquiry naturally arises—where and when, setting aside the reference to the Atlanteans and any other theosophic or occult explanation, did the ancients become acquainted with the exact length of this cycle? We have seen that it would have been impossible for western scientists of the present day to have obtained its measure from their own data, unless put in possession of its approximate length from some external source. It thence appears that the Maha Yuga period is strictly original, and could not have been got up within the historical period or from western data; and this being so, and it being found to agree so nearly with the best, latest, and most refined efforts of the combined intellectual strength of Europe, it follows that the archaic scientists were in possession of our astronomical periods ages before we, with all our boasted superiority to the ancients in such matters, had arrived at them by slow degrees and intense labor. Moreover this triumph of the ancients is more than complete; for though it may be claimed that whatever the archaic astronomers may have accomplished in reference to the bodies visible to the unassisted eye, they knew nothing of others, yet by the preceding it appears that our own astronomers can no longer point to *their* discoveries of Uranus and Neptune (which were marvels of telescopic power and intellectual penetration) as a point of vantage to which the scientists of a hoary antiquity could not attain.

And indeed, quite independently of the conclusions on this head derivable from the Maha Yuga, which might be vitiated if any great alteration is in future made in the mean motions of these two planets (but which we may predict will consist of thirty seconds per century or multiples thereof), it is said that one, if not both, of the most distant planets were known to the ancient writers.[1] This escaped notice until modern times, when by reference to any hand-book on Astronomy we may see that Uranus was discovered by aid of the first great reflecting telescope used in England, on the 13th of March in the year 1781; though its existence had been previously suspected, owing to unexplained perturbations in the movements of Saturn.[2] And similarly, the planet Neptune was discovered by us through the unaccounted-for movements of Uranus, on September 18th, 1846, when it was seen by Dr. Galle with a powerful telescope, in the very point in the sky where the calculations of Adams and Leverrier had indicated that it would be found.[3] The difficulties which the discoverers had to face were enormous,[4] but it is said that "both not only solved the problem, but did so with a completeness that filled the world with astonishment and admiration, in which none more ardently shared than those who, from their attainments, were best qualified to appreciate the difficulties of the question."[5] And every writer upon the subject for the last sixty years has sung pæans of victory over this celebrated performance as the crowning intellectual triumph of the present day;[6] but by the contents of the present paper it appears that the whole had been forestalled many ages ago by those despised ancients, whom modern Europeans have been in the habit of looking down upon as the very impersonations of superstitious ignorance.[7] . . ."

Mr. Stuart is, of course, far too careful a student to say that he has proved his case conclusively, to the point of absolute certainty. But let us, for the sake of clearness, accept the supposition that the case is proved conclusively; that the facts and deductions are entirely correct. What results will follow?

First, that all the planets, including Uranus and Neptune, and, perhaps, other planets still unknown to modern astronomy, do, in fact, come into conjunction with each other and with the sun (that is, gather together at the same point in the Zodiac, or close to the same fixed star) at regularly recurring periods separated by the enormous space of 4,320,000 years.

Second, that this fact was the basis of the cycle called the Maha Yuga, or Great Cycle, which lies at the foundation of the whole Indian philosophy of world-cycles, and which is suggested by the occurrence of

---

[1] *The Secret Doctrine*, i, 126, 128; ii, 512, 513. *Cf. Isis Unveiled*, i, 267, etc.

[2] *Orbs of Heaven*, 127, by Prof. Mitchell.

[3] Mitchell's *Astronomy*, 217.

[4] *Ibid*, 215, 216.

[5] *Popular Astronomy*, 179, ed. 1856, by Dionysius Lardner, D.C.L. For the high attainments and qualifications of Mons. Leverrier and Mr. Adams, see *Orbs of Heaven*, 138, *et seq.*

[6] Mitchell's *Astronomy*, 211 (Routledge's ed.)

[7] Cf. *Isis Unveiled*, i, 239.

the same figures in other ancient astronomical systems, notably the Chaldean and aboriginal Mexican.

Third, that the fact of such a general conjunction was known to the astronomers of an immensely remote period, presumably Atlantean or Lemuro-Atlantean (since the Aryan, the Fifth Race, did not begin to come into being until a much later period).

Fourth, that these Atlantean or Lemuro-Atlantean astronomers knew of the existence and orbital periods of both Uranus and Neptune, which modern astronomers have only quite recently discovered, by the aid of immensely powerful telescopes combined with highly developed mathematical science.

Which would involve the final conclusion that the Atlanteans or Lemuro-Atlantean astronomers either had equally powerful telescopes and an equal knowledge of mathematics; or that they obtained their knowledge in other ways—by the possession of the occult powers which would make them high Initiates. For we have been told that, to the awakened vision of such Initiates, the most distant nebulae, separated, perhaps, from the sun by spaces which light takes millions of years to traverse, appear as close, as visible, as "daisies in the next field."

C. J.

(*To be continued.*)

We are only worth the price at which God values us. True merit must be weighed in His scales, for it is His judgment which alone can decide between real and counterfeit virtue.—S. John Berchmans.

ALSACE AND LORRAINE

MODERN history finds it hard to discover the true feeling of Alsace and Lorraine only because a veil has been thrown over their own self-expression; while all, literally all, the facts of the case have been distorted and preverted to serve the purpose of an unscrupulous conqueror. It must be remembered that it is not Alsatians or Lorrainers who have made such persistent and indefatigible claims to German origin, to German intellect, to German likeness and spirit. It is German conquerors who have made these assertions for them; and the world always grows to believe, or at least half believe, what it is told often enough, and with a sufficient air of conviction. The claims Germany has made and is vigorously making, to a right over Alsace and Lorraine, have in large measure been believed by the world at large, though perhaps a few people outside of France, have supposed that some of their assumptions were rather sweeping. But in the main, Germany's claim that Alsace-Lorraine was and is German, has been accepted because the arguments she put forward appeared plausible enough on the surface, and because the average man is prepared to accept any reiterated definite statement on a subject about which he personally has little or no direct knowledge.

The claims of Germany are false. Even a surface examination of the facts demonstrates that Germany's so-called "right" is an assumption, and that her whole position is untenable and a premeditated fiction.

Germany bases her claim to Alsace-Lorraine on three major premises. First, ethnologically, Alsatians and Lorrainers are asserted to be German peoples, descendants of German tribes. Second, Alsace and Lorraine, it is said, had belonged by direct political *liaison* to Germany since the time of Charlemagne (described as "the first German Emperor." *cf.* any German encylcopedia.), and until Louis XIV "seized" them in 1679-1697 (Treaties of Nimwegen and Ryswick, respectively). This would give Germany possession of these territories for eight or nine centuries prior to that of France; and, therefore, in 1871, Germany only recovered that which was legally and rightly hers. Third, Alsatians and Lorrainers speak German, are German at heart, and, by all signs save those advanced by a few pro-French extremists, prefer to remain German.

Emphatically, these three claims are historically false and without foundation in fact. It will become evident that the theories, purporting to be scientific, which German vanity has created to serve its ends, are preposterous to an extreme. For it is vanity which has led Germany to claim all good things as German. And it must be remembered, on this very account, that recent generations of Germans have been brought up to believe implicitly any and every falsification of fact which the satisfaction of this vanity has made necessary, and it must therefore have

become almost an impossibility for the modern German at this time to shake himself free from the resulting delusions. For no regard whatsoever has been paid by them to the facts of history; neither to the outer events such as treaties or wars, nor to those more subtle mental attitudes which find expression in these events, as well as more clearly perhaps in literature and art.

A careful investigation of the German claims regarding Alsace and Lorraine reveals the absolute necessity of understanding the whole historic method and treatment which Germans have applied to these unfortunate peoples. Without a thorough comprehension of this method, its intellectual dishonesty and consequent scientific inaccuracy, the problem cannot be solved. History cannot be a thing to conjure with. History is the unravelling and outer expression of human character and human thought. Back of every human activity lie the thoughts that planned and motived it. The history of a nation or of a people differs only from individual biography in the immensity and complexity of its life—to which must be added that new factor of a united consciousness, which arises wherever the hearts of a group are bound together by some spiritual affinity. "What a man thinks, that he becomes," which is not to say that what he imagines he thinks will he become, but rather that those fundamental principles underlying all his thinking processes will react determinatively on his character, and must inevitably find their realization sooner or later in outer life.

The German interpretation of history,—equally of its own as of other countries,—has been systematically and deliberately falsified to such an extent that the writing of a fair and true account by a German of any period has become an impossibility. Persistent liars distort the truth—even its fragments,—when deliberately trying not to; and the intellectual dishonesty of German thinking is on such a colossal scale, that unless some special study has been directed towards the examination not merely of German historical research, but of other branches of German science, no real comprehension can be reached of how far-reaching and insidious their perversions have become. American scholarship in particular has lent itself (in the past willingly) to the admiration of this German product; and it is as yet a hard lesson to learn that a whole people, under the ægis of "exact science" and "sound scholarship," and quite apart from the direct influence of Prussian militarism, could so basely have misused the intellect and betrayed the trust of men.

But such is the fact, and German histories of Alsace and Lorraine prove it.

The German people, following such German thinkers as Kant, Fichte, Hegel, Haeckel, Harnack, Nietzsche, Treitschke, Bernhardi, and many like them almost as well known, who have led, and in a true sense represented their fellow countrymen for several generations, have succeeded not only in preparing and finally precipitating this war, but also in so impregnating the whole intellectual world with their point of view, which

is the fruit of their method, that all of literature, art, history, and politics have felt strongly this influence. Partly by sheer weight and numbers, partly by an array of accumulated facts and figures (generally untrustworthy because selected with a bias), partly because of a certain complexity and massiveness of mind, they have succeeded in affecting deeply the scholarship and education of our generation. As a result, now that war has revealed what it is that Germany and German scholars in almost every case were striving for, much of the critical study of art, of literature, of history will have to be restudied and rewritten. For it must never be forgotten that, however aside from the main issue a branch of study may be, respected German writers and widely-studied German university professors, sometimes openly, sometimes *sub-rosa,* but always with indefatigable zeal, have maintained the pre-eminence and superiority of Germany, of the Germans, and of everything which by its excellence they could claim as resembling even remotely their own lofty German standard.

This German racial pretension is the philosophical background of all Pan-German propaganda, the corner-stone of all the *Mittle-Europa* scheme, which, by its unscrupulous seizure of territory has finally raised the issues of Alsace-Lorraine, of Poland, and of the Balkan States. It is essential to understand this claim, otherwise no true perspective can be gained of any such complex problem as that which, thanks entirely to German dishonesty and self-delusion, the history of Alsace-Lorraine now presents.

Two main causes have led to this extravagant German attitude. The first and most obvious was the series of military and diplomatic successes of Frederick the Second and William the First, Prussian kings. From being disunited, backward, partly civilized peoples, the amalgamated Germans suddenly found themselves the conquerors of four important nations, immensely rich and able under the clever and unscrupulous leadership of Bismark, and the morally degenerate military aristocracy of Prussia, to become the dominant factor in European politics.

The second cause lay within and behind the outer evidence of the other, and may be traced in the leading thought and intellectual moulds of the Germanic peoples throughout their history, though more definitely, perhaps, since the Protestant Revolt, with its emphasis on self-expression which develops self-will, and as reinforced by the egotistical philosophies of Kant, Fichte, Hegel and Nietzsche.

The accumulated influence of this intellectual legacy can alone explain the unanimity with which German scholarship along so many different lines of research, has lent itself but to one end,—the aggrandizement of Germany and of everything remotely connected therewith. "The proud conviction forces itself upon us with irresistible power that a high, if not the highest importance for the entire development of the human race is ascribable to this German people," writes Bernhardi (*Germany and the Next War,* p. 68). Another well-established writer, Josef Ludwig

Reimer, said in 1905, "The Kultur of the Germans is actually the stimulous to our present European *Civilization* with which we are conquering the world." (*A Pangerman Germany,* p. 31). So, quite recently, an eminent doctor of theology and philosophy, a jurist, and professor of Berlin University, Dr. Adolf Lasson, writes, "The whole of European Kultur . . . . is brought to a focus on this German soil and in the hearts of the German people. It would be foolish to express oneself on this point with modesty and reserve. We Germans represent the latest and the highest achievement of European Kultur." (*Deutsche Reden aus Schwerer Zeit,* No. 4, p. 13. A series of pamphlets issued since the war by the Professors of Berlin University and others, typical, in every sense, of German character and mentality.)

Bald extracts such as these, which might be multiplied *ad infinitum,* do not immediately suggest the wide influence which this fundamental idea has had in affecting all German scholarship—and not alone scholarship, but everything to which the German has turned his attention. Take, for instance, their conception of art and of artists—it being remembered that our libraries and colleges are filled with text-books and "standard" works which are colored with just such falsifications. "Every great artistic achievement of France and Italy since the time of the Romans can be traced to families and classes with a strong mixture of Germanic blood, and, especially in earlier times, to the descendants of Germanic stocks, who had kept their blood, or at any rate their nature (*Art*) pure." (H. A. Schmid—Dr. of Philos., Professor of Art History at Göttingen—in No. 25 of the above cited series of pamphlets, p. 21.) This claim is methodically treated, and, to German satisfaction, is proved concerning at least the whole Italian Renaissance period, by an eminent anthropologist, lecturer and scholar, Herr Professor Ludwig Woltmann. He demonstrates that all the famous "Architects, Painters, Historians and Humanists, Naturalists and Philosophers, Authors, and Musicians" were of German parentage or descent; and his list includes exactly one hundred and seven names. But his reasons? Benvenuto Cellini had a blonde beard verging on red; Michael-Angelo Buonarotti, whose real name must have been Bohn-Rotto, or perhaps Beon-Rad, indicating Saxon origin; Leonardo da Vinci, presumably having corrupted his name from Wincke, must have been of the same stem, etc. Even Dante does not escape, so the *Divine Comedy* also should be esteemed as a German classic. (*Die Germanen und die Renaissance in Italien, passim.* Woltmann receives half a column in Meyers' *Konversations-Lexicon.* He died in 1907.)

So too, religion cannot and does not escape this burlesque. Josef Ludwig Reimer, jurist, traveler, and author, accredited by inclusion in *Wer ists* (Who's Who), "proves" Christ to have been German. In his book, *Ein Pangermanisches Deutschland* (Chap. XIV, p. 233), he says, summarizing the discussion of several chapters: "When we see how very closely Christ is identified with Germanic Nature [note the order], how at the same time he rejected the Jews and was in turn rejected by them;

when we see further that the *Homo judaeus* contains much German blood, and in earlier times must of necessity have had it still *purer than now,* especially in such a very mixed neighborhood (Galilee), out of which Christ sprang, why shall we not be permitted to designate as Germanic the Being of Christ, which is ours today, and always will remain so; entirely apart from the plausible evidence of a Chamberlain and of others who support His Arian origin, and apart also from the sceptical attitude (even when perhaps deliberate) about the legitimacy of His birth, which is widely circulated throughout Judaism!"

These quotations, which might easily be multiplied almost indefinitely, should illustrate to what lengths German vanity has gone. Christ, Greek art, the Renaissance, Dante, Charlemagne, even Jeanne d'Arc, born in Lorraine, are German to the degree in which they were excellent, or to which their possession might flatter the Germans and increase their prestige in their own eyes. Nor is this point of view confined to a small body of Pangermanists. The German school-child is educated in such ideas, German text-books and encyclopedia are based on them, and the whole fabric of German thought thus has its basis in vain delusions and insidious fictions.

Part I.

Returning to the three major German claims to Alsace-Lorraine,—the ethnological, the historic, and the cultural and personal,—it would seem best to take up first the ethnological or racial claim. A survey must be made of a very much controverted question,—who and from whence are the races in Europe?—which is highly technical in its details, but at the same time of such a nature that certain fundamental principles may readily be established by anybody who reads even a resumé of the vast literature involved. For, as Dr. T. Rice Holmes remarks in his really erudite study of Cæsar's *Commentaries,* the student need not "be afraid, even if he is not a Celtic scholar or a professional anthropologist, to form an opinion of his own. For he will observe that the specialists, in so far as they differ among themselves, are simply drawing their own conclusions from ascertained facts which are accessible to all." (*Cæsar's Conquest of Gaul,* p. 261).

A study of the languages surviving from earliest days in Europe indicates a close structural connection between seven great families or groups—the Hellenic, Italic, Celtic, Teutonic, Slavonic, Lithuanic or Lettic, and Albanian,—in fact, all the existing languages except Finnic, Basque, Magyar, and Turkish. Closely related to these are three Asiatic groups: Indic, derived from Sanskrit; Iranic, including Zend, Persian, etc., and Armenian. The name for this numerous, interrelated family of speech has been a subject for controversy, especially in the earlier days after Bopp's *Comparative Grammar* founded in 1833-35 the science of Comparative Philology. To call them Indo-Germanic or Indo-European is not only clumsy, but inaccurate. The first, adopted by Bopp,

is the favorite term in Germany; but French and Italian scholars see no reason why German should be taken as the type of European speech. Nor do these terms include the Armenian and Iranic branches. Aryan, a term popularized by Max Müller, while originally derived from the supposed center in Asia from whence these sister languages migrated, is now being used more and more by English, French and German students alike as a general term to describe not so much this interrelated family of peoples itself, as the now obsolete theories which dealt with them.

The origin of the Aryans then, became for years a bone of contention, and the modern Pan-German theories of a superior German race, God's own chosen people, are derived directly from the speculations, assertions, and conclusions of a long line of German writers on this question. It culminated in the works of Cuno, Pösche, Penka, and Schrader for scientific theory, and Fichte, Trietschke, Reimer and Bernhardi for their amplification and direct application to Pangermanism.

Max Müller jumped from the conclusion that, behind so many interrelated languages, there must be one primitive, stock-language, to the further, and absolutely unwarranted conclusion, that there must have been also a primitive stock-race. So instead of speaking only of the sources of the Aryan language, he spoke of an "Aryan race" and an "Aryan family," and asserted that there was a time "when the first ancestors of the Indians, the Persians, the Greeks, the Romans, the Slavs, the Celts, and the Germans were living together within the same enclosures, nay under the same roof." He further asserted that because the same forms of speech are "preserved by all the members of the Aryan family, it follows that before the ancestors of Indians and Persians started for the south, and the leaders of the Greek, Roman, Celtic, Teutonic, and Slavonic colonies marched towards the shores of Europe, there was a small clan of Aryans, settled probably on the highest elevation of Central Asia, speaking a language not yet Sanskrit or Greek or German, but containing the dialectical germs of all." (*Lectures on The Science of Language,* 2nd revised edition, pp. 211-212. Delivered 1861).

Dr. Isaac Taylor, an eminent English ethnologist, declares—"Than this picturesque paragraph more mischievous words have seldom been uttered by a great scholar." How true this estimate was, Dr. Taylor himself never knew. For to the German mind, an *Aryan* root-race, since it produced Germanic or Teutonic off-shoots, must have been essentially a *German* root-race, else how came so distinctive and superior a race as the Germans of history into being? And once the self-evident fact be grasped that the modern German language, which is at once the best, most scientific and most beautiful of languages (*vide* Fichte) has its roots in the primitive Aryan language, from whence it may also be traced as the foundation of practically all European, Iranic, and Sanskritic languages(!), what conclusion is left but that the German element is the one enduring, enlightening agent of an all-wise and far-seeing Divine

Providence, and is therefore, the leading race in the world? The terms Aryan and German are consequently practically interchangeable, and so they will be found in multitudes of German books.

This brand of vicious reasoning, which always returns upon itself, is characteristic of the German scientific method, though more often in conclusions formed, than in the logic of facts. For it is typical of the German that in the ordering of mere facts he can be sequential and logical to a degree, but when he is called upon to draw conclusions from those facts, in other words, to deal with the logic of ideas; he is incapable of the detachment from self, and of the judgment necessary for coherent, principled, let alone clear thinking.

Now it is an interesting commentary on the whole scientific and philosophical basis of the Pan-German claims, that the ethnological theory on which they are based is today absolutely discredited. French, English, and even some German scholars agree in showing "conclusively that the assumption of the common ancestry of the speakers of Aryan languages is a mere figment, wholly contrary to the evidence, and as improbable as the hypothesis that a small Aryan clan in Central Asia could have sent out great colonies which marched four thousand miles to the shores of Europe." (Taylor, *Origin of the Aryans,* pp. 4-5). There is not, or rather, never has been, such a thing as an Aryan *race.* "It cannot be insisted upon too strongly that identity of speech does not imply identity of race, any more than diversity of speech implies diversity of race," says Dr. Taylor (p. 5). "Language seems almost independent of race" (p. 204 *et seq.*).

As this cardinal ethnological principal bears directly on the fact that Alsatians speak a language which Germans can understand only with great difficulty, and the French not at all, it may be useful to note that in Italy where the south is Iapygian, Sicanian, and Greek, and the north Etruscan, Ligurian, Rhætian, Celtis, Herulian, Gothic, and Lombard, the speech is that of Rome, a city which itself "contained an overwhelming proportion of Syrians, Greeks, and Africans." The actual Latin blood in Rome was probably extremely small, but its speech extends over Italy, France, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Roumania, part of Canada and the United States, and practically all of South and Central America. English likewise, is today replacing Celtic in Cornwall, Wales, Ireland and Scotland, as well as Latin in other parts of the globe. German has replaced Celtic in the regions of the Danube and Main, and more recently has extinguished two Slav dialects, Polabian and Wend. The old Prussians spoke a sister language of the Lithuanian (Slavs); and though still from forty to sixty per cent Slav, speak German, which was imposed on them by the conquests of the Teutonic Knights.

Claims to Alsace, then, based on the fact that French is not spoken except by a minority, do not enter into the question at all; and any such claim, put forward in the face of so much self-evident scientific data which proves the absolute unreliability of the language test, is either

relying on popular ignorance and credulity to escape detection, or is a studied factor in a program of wilful deceit. As a matter of fact the Alsatians speak a dialect of their own, which, though largely German in vocabulary, is essentially French in structure, differing markedly from neighboring German. So much is this so, that even five hundred years ago Troubadour poetry could find expression in Alsatian; whereas German imitations, products of the Minnesingers, are in no way equal, lacking wholly, because of the medium of an entirely different language, the spontaneous lyrical flow and lightness of phrase characteristic of this poetry.

A further and final blow was delivered to Max Müller's Aryan race theory, by the series of anthropological discoveries that all the existing races in Europe show conclusive evidence of having lived just where they now are, back into prehistoric times, while there is no evidence whatever to show that they ever migrated from Asia. So entirely without exception has this been found to be, that "the ultimate result has been to bring about a conviction not only that there is no such thing as any pure Aryan race, but that the existence of a primitive Aryan language is doubtful" (*Op. cit.* p. 38. Delbrück, *Einleitung in das Sprachstudium,* pp. 131-137; Bacmeister, *Allemanishes Wanderungen,* Cuno, Schrader, etc.)

Modern discovery, therefore, seconded by some of the ablest German anthropologists, overthrows entirely not merely the probability, but the possibility of a primitive root-race which was the foundation of modern European races; and with this fact proves the complete falsity of the modern German's claim to represent the evolved quintessential perfection of that original stock. Likewise the German claim, corollary to the main one, that all neighboring races in Europe, such as the English, French, Italians, etc., are necessarily off-shoots of the main German stock, and merely a greater or less dilution of German with native barbarian or African blood, is equally false and absurd.

Yet this assertion is put forward today fearlessly and repeatedly. Meyers' *Konversations-Lexicon,* volume 6, p. 827, explains just how the French are German, largely because three tribes of disputed Germanic origin, the Franks, Goths, and Suevi-Alemanni, obtained a partial conquest of independent northern sections of what is now France (despite the fact that they were absorbed by the superior culture of the peoples they overcame). Meyers' encyclopedia corresponds, of course, with the *Encyclopedia Britannica* as a standard for reference. Under "English" the same type of argument is followed, though large parts of England, such as Wales, and Cornwall, and the red-haired sections of Scotland and North England, are either aboriginal or Celtic, while Essex, where the Teutonic element predominated, is about an equal blend of French and Celtic with Germanic. Only in a remote sense are the English, in Matthew Arnold's words, "A vast obscure cymric basis with a vast visible Germanic superstructure." (*On the Study of Celtic Literature,* p. 64): Arnold

learned his ethnology admittedly from Germans, who at that time were almost the only students in the field. So Dr. Karl Woltmann, professor at the Imperial University at Strasbourg, whose volumes on *Mediæval Painting* are a standard and erudite reference work in all libraries, claims as a matter of course that Alfred the Great was German, and he speaks highly of this typical English king because he "resuscitated the studies that lay so low; he had made himself master of the highest culture of the day, and had *taken the first place among the prose writers of the Germanic tongue*" (Vol. II, p. 279). This professor claims some of the best periods of the Dutch School for Germany, because, "The greater part of the Netherlands belonged in this age to the Duchy of Lotharingia (Lothringen, Lorraine) and therefore to the German Empire" (p. 282). There was no "German Empire" at this time, while the Duchy of Lorraine was independent even of the Holy Roman Empire. Alfred the Great was really a Gaul, and by no means a German, either in feeling, character, or mentality.

It is on just such assumptions and inaccurate statements that German public opinion has acquired the firm belief in its blood-authorship of England, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Alsace-Lorraine, Switzerland, Denmark, and others. "Would to God Professor Engel were right in maintaining that the English are Kelts. Then we should not have to be ashamed of our brothers!" wrote Pastor B. Lösche in 1914. One of the most illuminating revelations of the presence of a motive which for long has lain back of German science and method, has been the easy *volte face* effected on this same race question of England since the war. "England is now showing on what feeble feet its Germanism rests, how unsound, how profoundly unworthy of the German Thought it is. It cannot shake off its bitter accusers—its Shakespeare and Carlyle, its Dickens and Kingsley. It has committed treason against the spirit of its greatest men . . . "; and in the same strain: "Does one German cousin fight against another? We good-natured idealists have always dwelt upon this German cousinship. The three-quarters-Keltic England has no feeling of common Germanism." (Quoted by William Archer, *Gems of German Thought,* numbers 440, 439, and 442.)

From all that has gone before, one definite conclusion is established. The word Germanic has two uses. It is loosely used to describe a number of tribes and races which once overran Europe. It is also applied today by modern Prussians to describe themselves and their Empire; and these two applications cannot be reconciled. The modern German is at least as much a mixture of races and peoples as the Englishman, Frenchman, or Italian. Prussians are Lithuanians, at least forty per cent Slav; while Bavarians are just as conglomerate as Alsatians. No such thing as a pure Germanic stock survives at the present day. The German racial pretension, therefore, falls absolutely to the ground, since that which is today claimed as German is not the German of five, still less of ten or fifteen, centuries ago.

Specific German claims about the ethnology of France and of Alsace-Lorraine may now be more easily disposed of. They rest on the fundamental error of mixing the terms *race* and *nationality;* of implying that nationality is ninety-nine per cent a question of race. It is not. Present-day Americans, from a racial standpoint, whatever else they are, can neither correctly be restricted to surviving Red Indians, nor can they at this time be said to exclude, for instance, descendants of African negroes. It is true that Americans as a race, strictly speaking do not exist as yet; but as a nationality, however, their self-consciousness and power cannot be successfully questioned. In almost every case, national consciousness is an intangible spirit, sometimes limited by natural geographic boundaries, but quite as often regardless of them; and it seems to be more frequently the result of an ideal forged in the hearts, and exemplified in the persons, of first one and then another of the great heroes and figures of history. Groups of contiguous peoples catch fire from the leadership of such individuals, and are drawn together not primarily by conquest, which often does not last, but rather by their response to a common ideal, and to the mutual interchange of thoughts and experiences. King Arthur, legendary as he is in most of the stories, Alfred the Great, Richard the Lion-hearted,—these men were the active expression of England's spirit; they embodied successively the growth of English national consciousness. In France, Clovis, by his dedication of France to Christ; Charlemagne by his creation of a Christian Empire, ruled in a spirit of chivalry made famous by Roland, Oliver, and Bayard; St. Louis, crusader King; the Blessed Jeanne d'Arc,—these and a host of others epitomize France, and gave to her a self-conscious realization of her mission.

To all of which the German spirit is frankly hostile, rejecting on the one hand such an interpretation of history, and on the other, claiming everything French as German, because France was populated by Aryan and therefore Germanic tribes.

This distinction between race and nationality applies directly to Alsace and Lorraine. Border countries between Germany and France, since the days of Cæsar, and undoubtedly before, they were the scene of incessant conflict. As to the earliest known inhabitants, the *Commentaries* tell us that when the Roman General defeated Ariovistus and thereby prevented the German Suevi from migration over the Rhine, the land was inhabited by three Celtic tribes, the *Treviri, Mediomatrici,* and *Leuci. Trèves* is one remnant of their nomenclature, while Verdun comes from the name of an incorporated tribe, the *Verodunes.* The Germans claim that the Celts are part of the Indo-germanic stock (Meyers' *Konversations-Lexicon,* vol. x, p. 828.—"eine Volkes des indo-germanischen Sprachstammes"), or Teutonic race. They base their claim on the fact reported by Dion Cassius, the Greek historian, by Cæsar, by Tacitus in his *Germania,* and other sources, that the Celtæ and Belgæ were fair-

haired, blue-eyed, and tall, like their later and better-known conquerors, the Vandals and Huns.

The literature discussing this claim is vast in amount, and the use of the term "Celt" is so confused and at times all-inclusive, that the lay-reader is left hopelessly in the dark. But in the light of recent ethnological research, the old Celtic problem bids fair to reach an unexpected conclusion. Mr. Madison Grant in his exceedingly interesting book *The Passing of a Great Race,* opens with the sentence: "Failure to recognize the clear distinction between race and nationality and the still greater distinction between race and language, the easy assumption that the one is indicative of the other, has been in the past a serious impediment to an understanding of racial values. Historians and philologists have approached the subject from the viewpoint of linguistics, and as a result we have been burdened with a group of mythical races, such as the Latin, the Aryan, the Caucasian, and, perhaps, the most inconsistent of all, the 'Celtic' race. . . . It is, therefore, necessary at the outset for the reader to thoroughly appreciate that race, language, and nationality, are three distinct things, and that in Europe these three elements are only occasionally found persisting in combination, as in the Scandinavian nations" (pp. 3-4).

According then, to the older theories, the Celts, being a part of the original Aryan or Indo-germanic linguistic stock, are in essence Teutonic peoples. The German claimants are so eager to cover every conceivable point which might be used against them, that they frequently conflict and over-reach themselves. Statements about the inhabitants of early France and of Alsace-Lorraine afford ample illustration of this. The Celtic race, identified as such by ancient writers merely on the grounds of blue eyes and blonde or ruddy hair, cannot be distinguished, as far as these same ancient descriptions go, from Teutonic tribes such as Vandals, Goths, Lombards, and Burgundians. The Germans, possessing themselves china-blue eyes and blonde hair (not ruddy) instantly claimed the Celts as Indo-germanic, and Teutonic. But when a little more research proved that the so-called Celtic race, far from embracing most of the inhabitants of France, England, Scotland, Wales, Ireland, northern Spain and Italy, Belgium, and Alsace-Lorraine, as at first thought because these peoples spoke Celtic, must instead be limited to *either one* of three insignificant, racially distinct, remnants—the Bretons, the Welsh, or the Scotch Highlander,—then the German scientist (though not, as yet, the German public) discarded the Celts, and pinned his faith to Goths, Normans, and Burgundians. So we have one class of Germans (such as Meyers, Cuno, Schrader, Niehbur, Müllendorf and many others) whose assertions lead their fellow-countrymen to claim all France and all Frenchmen as German because they are descendants from the Celts. Then, in opposition, we have such renowned men as Herr Ottokar Lorenz and Herr Wilhelm Scherer who contradict this claim in their (for Germans, most moderate) *Geschichte Elsasses.* They find it necessary,

in order to eliminate an inconvenient French (!) element in Alsace, to disparage the Celts. Thus, "The Celts, as always happens with *moribund races,* were divided into two factions, one of which sought Roman protection while the other depended upon the Germans." Even Myers, wishing to come near the truth, states that, "the Alsatians belong, with the exception perhaps of the inhabitants of the northern part, to the alemannic, the Lorrainers to frankish Folkstem." (Under Elsass-Lotheringen, vol. 5, p. 727.) He maintains that both are German in origin, but the alemannic more purely so. Further on he says (p. 733): "The oldest historically known inhabitants of Elsass were the keltic Sequani and Rauriki, who followed the Germanic Triboker and Nemeter." We have no knowledge of these last mentioned, practically pre-historic tribes, but by seeking to preceed the Celts with German tribes, though quite without warrant, Meyers sought to provide for the most remote possible German heredity of Alsace.

Comparing and summing, therefore, the statements of these several scholars, it would be a fair inference to suppose that France (or Italy or England or Belgium for that matter) became a separate nation through some mistake on the part of a body of Germans who did not realize what they were doing; and so, by cutting themselves off from their fountain-head, and blending with inferior races, they turned themselves into degenerates and renegades who today are even fighting their Mother. Apparently, however, such degenerates can produce an occasional Rodin or Voltaire or Moliére (or Carlyle, etc. and etc.), who is a credit, despite his handicap, to the parent country.

The facts in the case, as far as they are ascertainable, may briefly be put as follows:

The original Celts, or at least, users of the Celtic language, somewhere before 1100 B. C. were spread over Central and Western Europe, long antedating the irruption of the Teutonic tribes. Earliest neolithic remains place them in Central France, Belgium and Southern Germany; they migrated west to England and east into Greece; they were called Gauls or Celts by the Romans, and Galatians by the Greeks (*Cf.* De Quatrefages and especially, Broca). They were "gigantic barbarians," with fair, very often red, hair, grey-blue eyes, and brachycephalous or with rounded skulls. They gave their language to the peoples they conquered, and were absorbed by the native populations. The only Celtic-*speaking* peoples remaining today are the round-skull, or brachycephalic Breton peasants; the short, long-skull, or dolichocephalous Welshman, dark in color; and the tall, light, often ruddy Scotch Highlander, also dolichocephalous. These groups are not physically similar, and their character and mentality are totally unlike. If one be descended from an original Celtic race, then the other two are not. The Scotch Highlander has been identified with the true Scandinavian type, tall, dolichocephlous, with an index of from 70 to 73, whose general structural and cultural characteristics places him with the Row Grave and Stængenæs skeletons

of pre-Teuton invasions, and therefore closely resembling the Swedes, Danes, and Frisians of today. The Welshman is now generally believed to be a residuum of pre-Celtic races "of immense antiquity." The French Bretons, with index over 80, at best are a mixed people, possibly related to the Slavs and even the Lapps, and having no racial elements in common with Welsh or Scotch. In passing, it might be noted that the great mass of Irish are Danes, Norse, and Anglo-Norman,—not Celtic,—together with a substratum of pre-historic elements similar to the earliest Welsh. The Irish, therefore, cannot scientifically claim national independence on any grounds of race.

About 100 B. C. the Teutons appeared on the scene,—first the Ostrogoths, the Huns, the Visigoths, the Cimbri, the Suevi, the Helvetians, and the Alemanni of the upper Rhine. There is a superficial resemblance between the Teutons and the Celts. Both races are tall, large limbed, and fair haired. But they "are radically distinguished by the form of the skull" (Taylor, *op. cit.* p. 109).

Ausonius, Lucan, Claudian, Martial, Tacitus, Calpurnius, Flavius, Propocius, and others, as well as Cæsar, describe these invasions; and German authors have industriously assembled all these quotations (Zeuss, *Die Deutschen,* p. 50 *et seq.;* Pösche, *Die Arier,* p. 25, *seq.;* Penka, *Or. Ar.,* p. 122; Diefenbach, *Or. Eur.,* p. 161, *seq.;* Müllendorf, etc.) Though fair, the Celtic complexion is more florid and freckled than the pink and white of the Teuton, while the eyes of the former are green, grey, and greyish-blue rather than the *"cæruli oculi"* of Tacitus. Dr. Holmes thinks that the keen observation of Cæsar led him to discriminate between the Germans and the Gauls (Celts), for he describes the latter as "resembling" the former, but not so tall, so fair, or so savage (*Op. cit.* Chapter on "Who Were the True Gauls?").

Cæsar's description of these first German invasions of France, which he met and defeated on the soil of Alsace and Lorraine, are very indicative in the light of recent events. Speaking of the ravages which the native Gauls (Celts) of Alsace sustained, he tells us that Divitiacus the Aeduan reported that about 15,000 Germans had "at first crossed the Rhine; but after that these wild and savage men had become enamored of the lands and the refinement and abundance of the Gauls, more were brought over, until about 120,000 of them were in Gaul." (*De Bello Gallico,* i, cap. xxxi). The *Commentaries* then describe the sufferings of various Celtic clans, notably the Sequani, exposed as they were on the border-land to the inroads of alien Germanic hordes. There is much revealed in Cæsar's shrewd description of these same Germanic tribes—description singularly applicable to modern German claims and methods. The Sequani were especially dejected for "Ariovistus, King of the Germans, had settled in their territory, and had seized a third of it, the best land in the whole of Gaul; and now he demanded that the natives should vacate another third, because a few months previously 24,000 Harules had joined him, and he had to find homestead land for them.

[In other words, as today, they wanted a "place under the sun," room to "expand," at another's expense.]

Within a few years, the entire population of Gaul would be expatriated, and the Germans would all cross the Rhine; for there was no comparison between the land of the Germans, and that of the Sequani, nor must the standard of living among the former be put on a level with that of the latter." (I, Cap. XXXI.)

Cæsar's victory was only temporary, however, and the Western Roman Empire collapsed under the repeated blows of the successive Teutonic hordes. But it is important to note that Celtic culture was superior to Teutonic, that the close natural alliance between Celtic and Latin led to the easy spread of the Roman conqueror's tongue, and that the Teutons did not recognize the Celtic speaking peoples as kin in any sense;—on the contrary, they called them Welsh, or foreigners. From this word are derived the names "Wales," "Cornwales" or "Cornwall," "Valais," "Walloons," and "Wallachian" or "Vlach."

So much for German claims that the Celts are German.

With the political and military *débacle* of Rome, Teutonic tribes, warlike and restless, spread over the whole of Europe. In the fourth and fifth centuries A. D. the Vandals established a kingdom in North Africa. Spain fell under the Visigoths, Portugal under the Suevi. Southern Gaul was also Visigothic; eastern Gaul, Burgundian; while the north was Frankish, until Charlemagne created an Empire and spread their influence throughout France. Italy was conquered first by the Ostrogoths and then by the Lombards. The Saxons and related tribes took the British Isles; while Norsemen and Danes invaded all the costal areas as far south as Spain.

Politically these conquests were real enough, but in point of population, there was no such radical change. As Madison Grant says, "all Europe had become *superficially* Teutonized" (p. 162). Alaric's army which conquered Italy and sacked Rome was very small relative to the whole population of Italy; and the actual numerical superiority of Goths in Theodoric's kingdom at Toulouse, over the layers of Celtic and Roman population, is very improbable.

The Teutonic element was the ruling, warrior class, and as such it gave its name to the various kingdoms. But in its turn this position meant that when the Mohammedan invasions broke the Visigothic and Vandal kingdoms in pieces, and only Charles Martel and his Franks prevented the Moors from conquering France as well as Spain, it was these same Teutonic over-lords who suffered the greatest loss, and were reduced in numbers.

The fact remains that "In France it is probable that nineteen-twentieths of the blood is that of the aboriginal races, Aquitanians, Celts, and Belgæ; while of the later conquerors the descendants of the Teutonic invaders, Franks, Burgundians, Goths, and Normans, doubtless contributed a more numerous element to the population than the Romans,

who, though fewer in number than any of the others, imposed their language on the whole country" (Taylor, *Op. cit.*, p. 204).

To sum up, then, in Lorraine as it emerges out of the Roman period, there were three main strains of blood—Celtic, then Roman, finally German; but the last was decidedly subordinate to the other two. The later Germanic migration of Alemanni and Frankish-Hessian peoples. settled in the open country. This left the cities in the hands of the Celto-Roman population, which accordingly impressed its language and laws upon the invaders. Roughly speaking, by the tenth century, or about a hundred years after the treaty of Verdun, Lorraine had succeeded in knitting together these diverse elements and it became as distinct a unit, with as marked an individuality, as any other national nucleus of Europe. The people are described by contemporary writers as possessing a character of their own, and were noted for wit, sensitiveness, a military and chivalric spirit, and a tendency to mysticism. Tauler and Brother Lawrence represent the last, while Jeanne d'Arc speaks for their military and chivalric spirit as well as for their mysticism. Nor should it be forgotten that it was in Lorraine that the Irish monk Columba found a congenial home in the sixth century, and laid the foundations for the future Christianity of the people.

What is true of Lorraine is in almost the same degree true of Alsace, where, however, there was more settling and inter-marrying between the Teutons and their subjects. But even Alsace as she emerged from the Roman period was still essentially Gallo-Frankish. The Celtic inhabitants had not been entirely dispossessed; and as the later trans-Rhine Teutonic immigrations had been gradual and less aggressive, there was less antagonism. They are described with "the characteristics of activity, enterprise, energy, independence, irony, and badinage ascribed to the people of the French realm," and they spoke in different localities both the *lingua romana* and the *lingua teudisca*. (For an exhaustive study, *cf.* Chas. Schmidt, *Les Seigneurs, les paysans, et la propriété rurale en Alsace.*) The solid peasant stock, which made up the back-bone of the country, reasserted itself, and though modified, it still felt itself to be one with Celto-Roman traditions, and the new French national spirit infused throughout France by Charlemagne.

ACTON GRISCOM.

(*To be continued*)

Have these three things always present to your mind: what you were, what you are, and what you will be.—S. Bernard.

THE CRUSADES

THE whole Christian world has watched with interest the recent developments in the East, and in the capture of Jerusalem has perhaps recalled to memory others of the many capitulations which Jerusalem has experienced during her long history. Naturally, for western peoples the greatest interest will center in the time when last the western nations held this much-disputed soil, during the great crusading movement nearly ten centuries ago; and when to this is added the fact that just about ten centuries more intervened between that time and the time of the incarnation of the great western Avatar, this most recent connection between the Holy Land and the West takes on a new significance.

Doubtless everyone is more or less familiar with the idea of cycles —the theory that individuals, nations, whole civilizations in fact, return in regularly recurring periods; a theory which has been conclusively worked out from the scientific standpoint by W. M. Flinders Petrie in his book, the *Revolutions of Civilization.* And when we consider not only the millennial recurrence mentioned above but also the fact that each of these periods has been marked by the most vital and far-reaching changes for the whole western world, it suggests the possibility, at least, of a thousand year cycle involving the joint activity and connection of East and West.

A comparison, even the most superficial, of our own time with that of the Crusades, shows certain broad characteristics which would seem further to substantiate the idea. Many of the tendencies which stood most in need of correction at the time of the Crusades, many of the evils which would naturally be followed by deep-seated changes, are practically duplicated in our own day. Of course, it will not do to carry such an idea too far; Europe in the XI century was still practically in a state of barbarism, while according to Mr. Petrie's tables we, at the present stage of civilization, are well over the crest of the wave, in some respects are well on toward the period of decay. We must expect difference then; but though there is not identity of characteristics there is nevertheless a parallelism which may well be considered as far as it goes.

To turn first of all to an external feature, is it a mere coincidence or is there meaning beneath the surface, in the position of the various European countries at the time of the Crusades? As in the present day, so then, France was foremost in the movement, bearing the main burden of the warfare. To borrow the words of one of the historians, "yielding readily to ideas, passing quickly from ideas to action, enthusiastic, vivacious France has the power of giving an impulse to the nations, as was seen in 1793, 1830 and 1848, and the thrill aroused in France vibrated over all western Europe." Italy came second in activity, but her interest and her work were more commercial than religious. England, because

of the readjustments necessarily following the Norman conquest, was unable to enter into the movement at the start, but shared more actively in the later Crusades. Spain took no part, being occupied first with the Moors and later with her own Crusade against the Albigenses, and Russia had not yet taken her place among the nations, being still, so to speak, in process of formation. As for Germany, occasional individuals entered into the movement, to be sure, but the nation as a whole looked upon it with disfavor. During the first wave of enthusiasm, Germany was occupied with her War of Investitures, and the events of that war would scarcely lead her to espouse with zeal a movement promoted by a Pope who had so endeavored to humble her Emperors. But further than this, Germany had an opportunity as time passed, to see the results so calamitous to many of the crusaders and to realize the first disadvantages to those who remained at home. Jealous of their power, the German barons were quick to oppose a movement which in other countries was impoverishing the nobles, lessening their number, reducing their military and political importance, and, as it were, playing into the hands of both the crown and the lower classes. And by avoiding the loss she missed also the gain. Hungary, though recently Christianized, was bitterly hostile to the Crusaders, albeit with considerable reason since the lawless, undisciplined hordes of the first crusade, travelling entirely without preparation or provision, overran her territory to the number of eighty or a hundred thousand—sometimes estimated at two hundred thousand—seized everything they could lay hands on, outraged the women, attacked the men, and burned and pillaged the towns, in one case massacring four thousand citizens. Hungary was not prepared to stop them, but in Bulgaria, which was equally hostile, the inhabitants attacked and killed them, reducing their numbers by many thousands. Curiously enough, then, the alignment of nations was roughly speaking, that of the present day.

As for the general characteristics of the two periods, where we have as a dominant feature of our own day, materialistic skepticism, crusading Europe went to the other extreme. There was no lack of religion, but it was fixed and dogmatic, full of superstition, and with it went fanaticism, bigotry and intolerance. The XI century, then, was probably quite as much in need of shaking-up as we are, though for quite the opposite reason. Then there was lack of unity—lack of unity of purpose and lack of national unity; that ferment working close beneath the surface everywhere at the present day and so tragically evident in Russia, was one of the great difficulties then as well as now. The reasons for it were different to be sure: economic conditions, lack of facilities for transportation and communication, limited trade and commerce, primitive methods of exchange were the natural preventives. In addition to these, the whole feudal system, opposing as it did, any centralized authority, recognizing no common laws, making each feudal lord a law unto himself with independent jurisdiction over his serfs and vassals, was a further barrier.

Numerous references are made in accounts of the time, to class-unrest and the wretchedness of the people—it must be remembered that this was well on toward the end of feudalism, and oppression of the serfs and privation and misery may well have been common. Whether this was merely a local condition or sufficiently widespread to have some influence in the Crusades, is a question. Certainly it was not organized as is our present-day counterpart of it, for the means of communication were too inadequate. Whatever may have been its actual value, thousands of the lower classes flocked to join the Crusades, so many serfs becoming freedmen in this way (manumission being a result of taking the vow) that a whole new class of society sprang up.

Like our own day, feudal Europe was cursed with individualism, resented authority, and lacked discipline,—a lack which cost the lives of hundreds of thousands in the first Crusade. It may be argued that these characteristics together with pride, arrogance, avarice and others of the vices which manifested themselves, are found to a greater or less degree in every age, being common to unregenerate man, and that in any great movement, our own war or another, some will be actuated by high ideals and noble qualities, while others—and usually a great majority, will blacken the cause with the low aims and evil passions of their kind. However, there are times when the sins of the world come more nearly to the surface than others, and the events of the Crusades would show lack of discipline, among high and low alike, to be one of the crying evils of the time.

Back of all the more obvious purposes of the Crusades and the tendencies which they were apparently meant to correct, stands the one great fact which was given in a recent sermon at the Chapel of the Comforter, regarding our present World War—namely that from time to time, the Master tries in one way or another to draw the world to Him, appealing now to love, now to pity and so on. The world, it was said, is full of the poison of self, which lulls it to sleep—the sleep of death. The analogy was used of a man dying of cold who must be roused from his lethargy if he is to live. The only way to save the world is to insist that it shall feel; the only way to make it feel is to make it suffer.

How this was done for XI century Europe is better left to a more detailed account of the individual Crusades. The story is more or less familiar to all—enthusiastic multitudes rushing into the project with fanatical zeal, meeting all too soon the pitfalls made by their own self-will and ungovernable natures; their sufferings by plague, pestilence and famine; the tragic end of countless numbers, mere heaps of bones in the desert; and the moderate success of the few in their several short-lived kingdoms and principalities. What the actual results of all this were to the people who took part in it, what changes may have been brought about in their own inner natures, is of course impossible to tell. And yet some indication of it is given in their life subsequent to their arrival

in the Holy Land. One of the chief indications is their change from fanatical intolerance to a reasonably generous recognition of their neighbors' views. In the laws drawn up in the Kingdom of Jerusalem, under the rule of Godfrey of Bouillon, the people were allowed, in almost every particular, to continue in their usual customs. This even went so far as to provide for the Syrian population a court under a Syrian official, though later a change was made to four Syrian and two Frankish officials, due perhaps to the inefficiency of the natives. Apparently entire toleration was granted to all; in the matter of an oath, for instance, Mohammedans took it on the Koran, Armenians, Syrians and Greeks on the cross, Jews on the Torah, etc.

According to one Mohammedan authority, the Musselman farmers found the Frankish rule more agreeable than the Musselman. This meant an extraordinary amount of adaptation to circumstances. Where kingdoms were being established and westerners were remaining permanently, it was necessary, of course, to maintain friendly relations with the surrounding states if possible. The military training and prowess of both Mohammedans and Franks was one point of contact between them, especially in view of their mutual contempt for the unwarlike Syrians and Greeks. But the Franks had come from a civilization which was just awakening; they had presumably little or no breadth of view, and certainly no preparation for their experiences in the East. Practical knowledge of the East and its problems was lacking, as was also any understanding of its peoples; their fanaticism and intolerance was an added barrier. Yet they accomplished the apparently impossible with remarkable success, and in a comparatively short time, we find one of their number writing that all who remained in the East had become orientals. "We have already forgotten the cities where we were born."

No such feeling was entertained, however, by the yearly pilgrims who continued to come from the West in great numbers, and who remained too short a time to gain an understanding of the situation. To them such an attitude toward the unbelievers was apostasy and their own continued intolerance was a source of much difficulty, as for instance, when in a siege of Acre, 1104, the Frankish leader agreed to spare the lives of those who surrendered to him, but soon found himself utterly unable to prevent their massacre by fanatical Pisans and Genoese. In spite of the fact that they were often troublesome, unruly and undisciplined citizens, these western newcomers were encouraged or even urged to remain in the East, for nothing but force of numbers could secure permanence of the Frankish possessions against the continual efforts of the Mohammedans.

Even such potential strength and security as the Franks did possess was by no means utilized, for the new surroundings had done little to overcome the individualism and aversion to authority with which they started out. The leaders were unable to get along harmoniously together; each wanted, and for the most part secured for himself a kingdom, but

instead of uniting their conquests into a strong league under one head, they remained just so many independent principalities under so many independent chiefs—practically a copy of feudal Europe. They had become broader and more liberal but the lesson of unity still remained unlearned.

This was not the case at home, however; not only did Europe grow in unity as the Crusades progressed, but every department of her life, economic, intellectual, religious, took on new vigor, every class of society underwent a change, the Dark Age was left behind, and a rapid development began. In certain of the countries, France particularly, the nobles had joined the Crusades in large numbers, occasionally entire families leaving the homeland for several generations. This removed what had previously been the chief source of opposition to kingly rule, and resulted in a greater centralization of authority and an immense increase for the crown of both power and wealth. At the same time a new citizen class was arising, due as before mentioned, to the large number of serfs released from bondage, some by masters who themselves took the cross, others by the papal decree freeing all bondsmen who did so. Many of these freedmen, hitherto bound to the soil, turned for a livelihood to industries, of which a number had recently been imported from the East and others had received fresh impetus from that source. Thus a class grew up which was independent of the soil and which, leaving the country, congregated in the towns. The king in turn, was quick to take advantage of the changing conditions, and by affording protection to this growing citizen class, still further strengthened his power.

Besides the new industries and improved methods in old industries, there were new articles of every description brought from the East,—new household appliances, fabrics, natural products, fruits, grains, etc. The increase of import and export trade which resulted, still further changed and developed the life of the time, for through localities which had previously been shut off, or hemmed in, by natural barriers of various kinds, great trade routes grew and commercial centers sprang up. And perhaps the most important of all economic effects, was the introduction of a new system of exchange. At the beginning of the Crusades the means of exchange was primitive, in some localities barter was still the custom, though coin was largely used even at that date. The crusading prince, starting out on his journey, had to carry with him in specie, a sufficient amount to defray all his expenses and pay his men. This was reasonably safe because of the warlike character of the company, but the inconvenience of such a method will be apparent. Gradually there developed the custom of securing letters of credit from some wealthy person remaining at home, usually at a heavy rate of interest which the Church tried in vain to regulate. And from this grew a regular system of letters of exchange and a balancing of debits and credits very similar to our own modern system.

Big banking houses sprang up, notably those of Genoa, Pisa and Siena, having offices in all the principal cities of the East and providing by means of their letters of credit, sums of any size at any time and place. When the Religious Orders were formed, they of course, made extensive use of this system and before very long they themselves became bankers on a large scale. The Knights Templars were especially active in this capacity; by the Pope they were given charge of all the vast funds collected for the Holy Land and in addition they made large loans at very high interest to the monarchs of the different countries. In time the regulation of the money traffic of the entire world lay in their power. Such changes in the commercial life naturally revolutionized the world—commercially, at least, old national boundaries lost much of their importance; old national differences were wiped out; transportation and travel became easier and simpler; the productive power of the communities was accordingly increased; and interest became united with interest.

But all this growth was merely economic. Other results of the Crusades were intellectual, moral and spiritual changes equally important and far-reaching if not more so. With the interchange of thought between East and West and the resultant widening of view, new energies were awakened in the intellectual life of the time. The old orthodox ideas of the Middle Ages became obsolete, their narrow mental barriers becoming too restrictive. Slowly but surely, men began to shake off the theological despotism which the Church had so long exercised, to strive for spiritual freedom, to awaken to the possibility of a breadth of thought and speculation, the audacity of which would have been considered impious a short time before. The whole thought of the time became opened up, the soil prepared for the great and rapid development including both the Renaissance and the Reformation, which followed close on the fall of the Eastern Empire and the dwindling of the power of the Papacy. It has been said that the Renaissance must be "viewed mainly as an internal process whereby spiritual energies latent in the Middle Ages were developed into actuality and formed a mental habit for the modern world"; and can it not be said with equal truth that the Crusades furnished the original impetus to that evolution which, including the Renaissance in its course, brought the modern world into being and gave to the nations of the West a common civilization?

JULIA CHICKERING.

Live in this world as if God and your soul only were in it, so shall your heart be never made captive by any earthly thing.—S. John of the Cross.

EASTERN AND WESTERN PSYCHOLOGY

V

The Infusion of Divine Life

IN a very valuable study, "Evolution and the Need of Atonement,"* the author, whose purpose is, to bring about a reconciliation between biological and spiritual knowledge, hits upon a striking and brilliant simile for the development of our spiritual life and consciousness:

"We may assume," he says, "for the sake of argument, that some form of marine life was the most primitive. Now when a marine organism begins to adapt itself in the direction of a littoral life, we have obviously a succession of environmental changes so marked as to produce a very rapid adaptation, for even the smallest change will be markedly favorable or unfavorable. The change to a life at first between tide-marks, then wholly on shore, must introduce such a vast series of new factors that an incredibly huge number of experimental variations must occur; some useless, some committing to one line of advance, some to another. Again, equally obviously, organisms that had gone very far in adapting themselves to a particular line of development, could not go very far under the new conditions, for retrogression is impossible; the majority would fail completely, some few would get on in a lowly way, their equilibrium-position being reached in a comparatively short time and comprising relations with a comparatively small range of environmental conditions. An example of this may be found in the littoral and land crustacea. The creatures that succeeded best would be those who had adapted themselves completely to the *simpler* conditions of the sea, yet had not committed themselves by over-specialization, but were ready to respond to the new stimuli of the shore and the land. And in just the same way the land organisms which early reached their equilibrium-position—i. e., the position involving approximately *complete* adaptation to a small number of conditions—would again be incapable of what we call 'progress' into a higher and more complex development. Thus we see that the organism which becomes 'highest' is that which never reaches a stable position, but is always ready to respond to the fresh *higher* environment conditioned by its last progressive variation."

The passage is very carefully written, in order that it may be a quite exact description of biological law, so far as that law is known. But the real purpose of the author goes much farther: He is supplying, from biology, an illustration of the operation of spiritual law; the

* By Stewart A. McDowall, Cambridge University Press.

operation of spiritual law at the critical stage when we are passing, or seeking to pass, from material to spiritual life. The author depicts one of the great critical periods in biological evolution, when the beings which had hitherto been living in water were beginning a new chapter in life, emerging from the water and establishing themselves on land, or, as it would, perhaps, be truer to say, establishing themselves in the lower strata of the air. They will henceforth dwell surrounded by the element air, instead of the element water; and success will mean complete adaptation to this finer medium. It is really a new birth; a death to water-life and a new birth into air-life. Therefore it is a real and natural analogy with the spiritual rebirth, which is the passage from a grosser to a finer medium, or, if one prefer the expression, the passage from a lower to a higher plane. And just because the author is at great pains to make his biological description as exact as possible, it will pay to study and ponder over every sentence. It is a genuine parable, following the example of the Western Master, who bases so much of his spiritual teaching on simple biological analogies.

Before we consider this analogy, it is worth while to turn aside for a moment, to quote a grim passage in which the author raises and answers the question: What is the fate of an organism which, having emerged into the air, elects to return again to life in the water?

"What can we say, then, of a land-organism which once more betakes itself to the sea? Let us take for example the whale. It can never return to true gills and fins of the same nature as, or as zoologists would say, homologous with, those of a fish. At best it can but develop similar or analogous organs, and it will be so far behind the fish in adaptation to marine conditions that its efforts may be regarded as hopeless: it has tried to turn back, failed, and is eventually added to nature's flotsam and jetsam, being incapable of further progress." Or, as the Bhagavad Gita says, it "has lost both worlds."

Returning to our first quotation, describing the development which does not fail, but succeeds, let us try to add to it certain considerations which we reached in preceding chapters. In the first place, it is quite evident that the emergence from water-life to air-life would be absolutely impossible unless the air were already there, with its element of oxygen, giving the possibility of life. In the same way, it would be entirely impossible for us to emerge from material life to spiritual life, unless the spiritual world were already there, pervaded everywhere by spiritual, life-giving force, as oxygen everywhere pervades the nitrogen and other inert elements of the air. It is interesting to recall that the earlier name of nitrogen was "azote,"—that which cannot support life, as contrasted with oxygen, which can and does support life. Therefore our whole possibility of emergence into spiritual life, our possibility of establishing ourselves on the spiritual plane, depends on the pre-existence of spiritual life, everywhere present in the spiritual world, pervading the spiritual plane.

On the other hand, the presence, even from the beginning, of the oxygen-containing air was not enough, in itself, to cause the emergence of living things from the water. Air and water—like the spiritual and material planes—might have continued in contact for ever, without bringing about the great transformation, the new birth from above. The perpetual presence and readiness of the air, of the spiritual world, was not enough. There was needed the impulse in the water-dwelling beings, to come forth, first to the borderland between low and high tide, and then into the clear air.

Orthodox biology simply records the fact of this emergence, but does not seek to explain it. Darwin practically considered this tremendous step in evolution, like all steps in evolution, as a "happy accident." But we have seen already, first, that this infinite multiplication of "happy accidents" is more miraculous than miracles; and, second, that our conscious experience in evolution, in spiritual life, gives us excellent ground for holding that, just as our spiritual evolution is invariably accompanied by the sense of guidance and help by conscious, responsive spiritual forces (manifestations of a *personal* spiritual consciousness and force), so we are justified in believing that the earlier stages of our evolution, from the very earliest, must have been guided by conscious, consciously acting spiritual forces, though we may not be able to form any clear idea of their character. So we have ground for believing that the emergence from water-life to air-life must have been the result of two things: first, the impulse of growth, the "vital drive," in the living things themselves; and, second, the instigation, guidance and supervision of their emergence by conscious spiritual forces, lending, at that point, the same aid which we have such full experience of, at a later point.

But there is a third condition of success, a condition absolutely indispensable, without which failure is quite certain, even though all other conditions of success are abundantly present. This essential condition is eternal effort, eternally renewed. There could be no more fatal mistake than to think that a stage of spiritual life will be reached, comparatively early, perhaps, at which effort will not be needed; in which we shall be able to rest in inactivity. We shall find rest it is true, but it will be the rest of perpetual effort in complete harmony with spiritual law; the element of rest lies in that harmony, and by no means in cessation of effort. On the contrary, at each advance, the effort required will be greater, more diversified, just as the effort of a man is infinitely greater and more diversified than the effort of a sea-anemone. Of course, to compensate, the man has infinitely more power to make effort than the sea-anemone. So each spiritual advance, far from bringing "rest," brings the imperative necessity for greater and ever greater effort; but, in compensation, it brings also greater and ever greater strength, greater power of effort. Popular religion, as expressed, for example, in the inscriptions upon tombstones, seems to promise that

with death comes rest: "Let him rest in peace." But, while there is rest from one kind of effort, it would seem to be certain that there is a new effort of another kind, since this is a universe of perpetual motion. But popular religion has at least this safeguard: It teaches, with entire definiteness, that effort must continue, because imminent danger continues, up to the very moment of death; so far, it appears to teach the literal truth.

We shall be well advised, therefore, at the very outset, clearly to realize, and courageously to face the fact that we shall reach no condition of rest which will mean surcease of effort; but, on the contrary, that without incessant, unbroken, unflagging effort, we can make no progress at all; nay, each step gained will mean more and greater effort. For such is the Law of Life universal.

Let us, for a moment, look at this inflexible law from the other side. There is, as we have seen, the imperative necessity of continuous effort, never ceasing but perpetually increasing. Yes; but does not that mean that we are inherently capable of just that kind of effort; of effort which shall perpetually increase, both in quality and in quantity? The power to make effort is, then, in a sense, the divinest power we have, and we have it perpetually; further, effort invariably carries compound interest; each effort made adds definitely and measurably to our capital of power, our ability to make further effort.

Let us go back for a moment, and see how our biologist has expressed this law of perpetual and perpetually increasing effort. He expresses it thus: "Thus we see that the organism which becomes 'highest' is that which never reaches a stable position, but is always ready to respond to the fresh *higher* environment conditioned by its last progressive variation;" always ready to respond by effort, as each step is gained.

It would be interesting and fruitful to examine the way in which this law of continuous and continuously increasing effort works out in the field of biology, and especially in the passage across that borderland between water-life and air-life, our symbol of the spiritual rebirth. But, for the present, we must be content to remind ourselves that in the biological field the rule is, that each individual must work each day to secure, often with great difficulty and effort, the food for that day. Creatures which lay up stores, like the bees, the squirrels, the jays, are a very small minority. The rest must literally work out the prayer: "Give us this day our daily bread." And every creature has its enemies, which ceaselessly beset it, so that every bird, for example, is perpetually toiling, perpetually vigilant—and perpetually rejoicing. We should learn all three lessons and apply them all.

We shall try to see, later in this enquiry, how, according to recorded experience and experimental knowledge, this law of ceaseless and increasing effort works out in the spiritual world. For the present, however, we shall consider another side of the problem.

Three conditions, as we saw, are involved in this transformation from the material to the spiritual plane, or in its biological analogy. These are, first, the pre-existence of the higher plane or world, pervaded by the powers which support life; second, the inherent drive in the organism, expressing itself in the power of ceaseless effort; and, third, the guiding and fostering power of the conscious spiritual forces which, if our view be true, inspire and oversee both transformations.

If it be true that, as we are making our way from material life to spiritual life, we are, in fact, guided, guarded, helped, ceaselessly inspired by spiritual powers which respond by personal consciousness to our personal consciousness, in what way do those who have immediate experience of this process describe it? What is the direct testimony of experimental psychology, in both East and West, concerning this vitally important experience?

There is a beautiful passage in the Brihad Aranyaka Upanishad which describes, not so much the actual passage to the spiritual world, as the spiritual condition of those who have made the passage and are already at home there, freely breathing that finer air; they have largely received, and perfectly responded to, the infusion of Divine Power from above, and have become one with the very essence of that Divine Power. The Divine Life has become their life. It is of high interest and true significance that, just as Spirit means "breath," the divine Breath of Life, so the sanskrit Atma means breath, and, pre-eminently the Divine Breath, the Holy Spirit. In the passage to be quoted, the word Atma is translated Soul:

"Thus far of him who is under desire. Now as to him who is free from desire, who is beyond desire, for whom the Soul is his desire. From him the life-powers do not depart. Growing one with the Eternal, he enters into the Eternal.

"When all desires that were hid in the heart are let go, the mortal becomes immortal, and reaches the Eternal.

"And like as the slough of a snake lies lifeless, cast forth upon an ant-hill, so lies his body, when the Spirit of man rises up bodiless and immortal, as the Life, as the Eternal, as the Radiance.

"The small old path that stretches far away, has been found and followed by me. By it go the Seers who know the Eternal, rising up from this world to the heavenly world.

"Who knows the Soul, and sees himself as the Soul, what should he long for, or desiring what should he fret for the fever of life?

"By whom the awakened Soul is known while he dwells in the wilderness of the world, he is creator of all and maker of all; his is the world, for he is the world.

"Even here in the world have we reached wisdom; without wisdom, great were thy loss. They who are illumined, become immortal. Others enter into sorrow.

"When a man gains a vision of the godlike Soul, the Lord of what has been and what shall be, he fears no more.

"At whose feet rolls the circling year with all its days, Him the gods worship as the one, the light of lights, the immortal Life.

"In whom the five hierarchies of beings and the ether are set firm, him I know to be the Soul. And knowing that deathless Eternal, I too am immortal.

"They who know the life of life, eye of the eye, the ear's ear, heart of the heart, have found that eternal Ancient, the Most High.

"This is to be understood by the heart: there is no separateness at all. He goes from death to death who beholds separateness.

"This immeasurable and unchanging Being is to be beheld as the One. The stainless Soul is higher than the heavens, mighty and sure.

"Let the sage, the follower of the Eternal, knowing this, strive to behold it in vision. Let him not meditate on many words, for words are weariness.

"This is the mighty Soul unborn, who is Consciousness among the life-powers. This is the heaven in the heart within, where rests the ruler of all, the master of all, the lord of all. He grows not greater through good works, nor less through evil. He is lord of all, overlord of beings, shepherd of all beings. He is the bridge that holds the worlds apart, lest they should flow together. This is he whom the followers of the Eternal seek to know through their scriptures, sacrifices, gifts and penances, through ceasing from evil towards others. He who knows this becomes a sage. This is the goal in search of which pilgrims go forth on pilgrimages.

"Knowing Him, the men of old desired not offspring. What should we do with offspring, they said, since ours is the Soul, the All? They became saints, ceasing from desire of offspring, the desire of the world, the desire of wealth. For the desire of offspring is a desire for wealth, and the desire for wealth is a desire for the world. For these both are desires. But the Soul is not that, not that. It is incomprehensible, for it cannot be comprehended; it is imperishable, for it passes not away; nought adheres to it, for it is free; the Soul is not bound, fears not, suffers not.

"He who knows is therefore full of peace, lord of himself; he has ceased from false gods, he is full of endurance, he intends his will. In his soul he beholds the Soul. He beholds all things in the Soul. Nor does evil reach him; he passes evil. He is free from evil, free from stain, free from doubt, a knower of the Eternal."

In this beautiful passage, there are the following elements: The knowing of the divine power the heaven of the heart; the recognition, in this divine power, of the quality of consciousness, the personal quality expressed by the words, the Lord, the Shepherd, the Master; the transfer of the life, through this infusion of the Divine Life, from this world to the heavenly world; the glory of that immortal life in the Eternal.

Let us compare with this, certain passages from Western spiritual experience, which describe not so much the consummation as the process of the infusion of the Divine Life, or, as it is called "the presence of God" in the heart. The best passages are, perhaps, those which describe the spiritual experience of Saint Teresa who, to a pure, courageous and rejoicing heart, added a clear, well-balanced understanding and a gift of eloquent expression.

"I used to have," Saint Teresa writes, "at times, as I have said, though it used to pass quickly away,—certain commencements of that which I am now going to describe . . . . and sometimes even when I was reading,—a feeling of the presence of God would come over me unexpectedly, so that I could in no wise doubt, either that He was within me, or that I was wholly absorbed in Him. . . . For the soul is already ascending out of its wretched state, and some little knowledge of the blissfulness of glory is communicated to it."

Again Saint Teresa writes: "So, in the beginning, when I attained to some degree of supernatural prayer—I speak of the prayer of quiet—I labored to remove from myself every thought of bodily objects. . . . I thought, however, that I had a sense of the presence of God . . ." "It is the settling of a soul in peace, or rather Our Lord, to speak more properly, puts it into peace, by His Presence, as He did just Simeon: for all the faculties are calmed. The soul understands after a manner far different from understanding by the exterior senses, that she is now joined nearer to her God, for that within a very little while more she will attain to the being made one with Him by union. . . . Those who are in the prayer of quiet are so near, that they perceive they are understood by signs. They are in the palace, close by their King, and see that He already begins here to bestow on them His Kingdom . . ." "There is raised in the interior of the soul so great a suavity that makes her perceive very plainly that Our Lord is very near to her. I call it the prayer of quiet, for the repose it causeth in all the powers: so that the person seems to possess God as he most desires . . .. though the soul perfectly sees not the Master that teaches us, yet plainly understands He is with her."

Many of those whom the West rightly calls saints, because they have experienced and borne witness to this infusion of the Divine Life, have put on record exactly the same sense of the presence of God in their hearts. A beautiful expression of this experience is that of the great French teacher of mystical theology and religious discipline, Father Louis Lallemant:

"When, after a long cultivation of purity of heart, God would enter into a soul and manifest Himself to it openly by the gift of His holy presence . . . the soul finds itself so delighted with its new state, that it feels as if it had never known or loved God before." And elsewhere in the same treatise on Spiritual Doctrine, Father Lallemant writes very wisely of the renunciation of the world, the mortification

of worldly desires, on which such stress was laid in the Upanishad we have quoted. Father Lallemant says: "The reason why we are so little illuminated by the lights of the Holy Spirit, and so little guided by the motions of His gifts, is that our soul is sensual beyond measure, and full of a multitude of earthly thoughts, desires, and affections, which extinguish within us the Spirit of God. Few give themselves wholly to God, and abandon themselves to the leadings of the Holy Spirit, so that He alone may live in them and be the principle of all their actions."

In the Katha Upanishad, we have exactly the same teaching concerning "the desires that dwell in the heart:"

"The great Beyond gleams not for the child, led away by the delusion of possessions. 'This is the world, there is no other,' he thinks and so falls again and again under the dominion of Death."

It is because of these desires dwelling in the heart, these many attachments to the familiar, long-inhabited world, that the beginning of the way is so difficult, so full, not so much of suffering, as of the dread of suffering. For this reason, so many shrink from the attempt; as, in our opening parable, we may imagine that the water-dwellers clung desperately to their familiar world, dreading and shrinking from emergence into the new world of air and sunlight. Some refused even to try; some, who tried, turned back, but never found again what they had lost.

This trial of the beginning of the way, a trial destined to be overcome, and to dissolve in splendor, has been described with striking likeness in the East and the West. Thus we find Father Louis Lallemant writing:

"At first, divine things are insipid, and it is with difficulty we can relish them, but in the course of time they become sweet, and so full of delicious flavor, that we taste them with pleasure, even to the extent of feeling nothing but disgust for everything else. On the other hand, the things of earth, which flatter the senses, are at first pleasant and delicious, but in the end we find only bitterness in them."

So we find the Bhagavad Gita teaching:

"That which at the beginning is as poison, but in the outcome is like nectar, that is the happiness of Goodness, springing from clear vision of the Soul. But the happiness which springs from the union of the senses with the objects of desire, in the beginning like nectar, but in the outcome like poison, that is declared to be the happiness of Passion."

It would not be easy to cite two passages which more clearly prove the identity of spiritual experience, which forms the basis of the real psychology, the "soul-science," in the East and the West.

CHARLES JOHNSTON.

(*To be continued*)

ON THE SCREEN OF TIME

THE CAUSES AND CONDUCT OF THE WAR

PART II (*Continued*)

THE CONDUCT OF THE WAR

THERE can be no peace in the world until the men and women of Germany repent of their country's crimes. But they will not repent until suffering has brought them to their knees, and they will not suffer to that point unless America comes to understand, as she does not yet understand, the nature of Germany's aims and methods. Again and again it must be repeated and proved that Germany desires world conquest; that her idea of conquest is to enslave, by means of intimidation and outrage, for her own supposed benefit, the peoples she subjugates, and that when she cannot enslave she murders them with absolute ruthlessness and with what she considers heroic good cheer.

As stated already, there is proof of this and to spare. But it will be best further to examine the circumference of Germany's action—the works of her servants, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, Turkey—before dealing with her nearer iniquities in France and Belgium.

Blackened by sins so innumerable, so atrocious, it would be impossible to select the German worst; but Germany's responsibility for the treatment of the Armenians is as cowardly and as hideous an offence as any of which she has yet been convicted. In "The Causes of the War," it was pointed out that the friendship between the Sultan Abdul Hamid and the Emperor William was at no time disturbed by the Armenian massacres. As Gibbons says: "The hecatombs of Asia Minor passed without a protest. In fact, five days after the great massacre of August, 1896, in Constantinople, where Turkish soldiers shot down their fellow-citizens [Armenians] under the eyes of the Sultan and of the foreign ambassadors, Wilhelm II sent to Abdul Hamid for his birthday, a family photograph of himself with the Empress and his children" (*The New Map of Europe,* p. 63).

The Emperor William and the Sultan were congenial spirits. The "Prussianization" of the Poles and Alsatians was conducted on the same general principles as the "Ottomanization" of the Armenians. With the advent of the Young Turks, who had been educated in Germany or by Germans, the program was carried out more radically and consistently. The Adana massacres of 1909, more terrible than the Hamidian massacres of 1895-6, occurred within a year of the proclamation of the Young Turk Constitution. The massacres of 1915—which, as Mr. Henry Morgenthau has testified, were "encouraged and aided by German army officers"—were the most atrocious of any. Mr. Morgenthau was the

Ambassador of the United States to Turkey until diplomatic relations were severed. Speaking in New York on December 10th, 1917, he further said:

> "I was at Constantinople when the massacre began. I was personally told by the Turkish authorities that their forefathers, when they took Turkey, determined to destroy the Armenians; that now, after 450 years, they were going to make up for that little mistake [of not having exterminated them sooner], and that they were going to destroy them then. They gloried in the fact that they were able to accomplish in thirty days what Abdul Hamid had not been able to do in thirty-one years of his reign. They were determined to do it—nothing could stop them—and as I have said before, they could have been stopped if they had not been encouraged by the Germans, and when all the facts are known it will be the darkest mark against the Germans of any of their vandalism."

In a pamphlet entitled *The Murderous Tyranny of the Turks,* by Arnold J. Toynbee, with a preface by Viscount Bryce (which can be obtained from the G. H. Doran Company, 38 West 32nd Street, New York, for five cents), it is stated:

> "Only a third of the two million Armenians in Turkey have survived, and that at the price of apostatising to Islam or else leaving all they had and fleeing across the frontier. The refugees saw their women and children die by the roadside; and apostacy too, for a woman, involved the living death of 'marriage' to a Turk and inclusion in his harem. The other two-thirds were 'deported'—that is, they were marched away from their homes in gangs, with no food or clothing for the journey, in fierce heat and bitter cold, hundreds of miles over rough mountain roads. They were plundered and tormented by their guards, and by subsidised bands of brigands, who descended on them in the wilderness, and with whom their guards fraternised. Parched with thirst, they were kept away from the water with bayonets. They died of hunger and exposure and exhaustion, and in lonely places the guards and robbers fell upon them and murdered them in batches—some at the first halting place after the start, others after they had endured weeks of this agonizing journey. About half the deportees—and there were at least 1,200,000 of them in all—perished thus on their journey, and the other half have been dying lingering deaths ever since at their journey's end; for they have been deported to the most inhospitable regions in the Ottoman Empire: the malarial marshes in the Province of Konia; the banks of the Euphrates where, between Syria and Mesopotamia, it runs through a stony desert; the sultry and utterly desolate track of the Hedjaz Railway. The exiles who are still alive have suffered worse than those who perished by violence at the beginning.
>
> "The same campaign of extermination has been waged against the Nestorian Christians on the Persian frontier, and against the Arabs of Syria, Christians and Moslems without discrimination. In Syria there is a reign of terror. The Arab leaders have been imprisoned, executed or deported already,

and the mass of the people lie paralyzed, expecting the Armenians' fate, and dreading every moment to hear the decree of extermination go forth.

"This wholesale destruction, which has already overtaken two of the subject peoples in Turkey, and threatens all that 60 per cent. of the population which is not Turkish in language, is the direct work of the Turkish government. The 'Deportation Scheme' was drawn up by the central government at Constantinople and telegraphed simultaneously to all the local authorities in the Empire; it was executed by the officials, the Gendarmerie, the Army, and the bands of brigands and criminals organized in the government's service. No State could be more completely responsible for any act within its borders than the Ottoman State is responsible for the appalling crimes it has committed against its subject peoples during the War."

More than one German teacher, stationed in Asia Minor to spread the blessings of German Kultur, has complained that he would have no pupils left to instruct, as it was the Armenians and not the Turks who went to school. Thus, Dr. Martin Niepage, Higher Grade Teacher in the German Technical School at Aleppo, appealed in vain to the German authorities "to put a stop to the brutality with which the wives and children of slaughtered Armenians are being treated here" (*The Horrors of Aleppo,* seen by a German eyewitness; obtainable from the G. H. Doran Co., New York, for five cents). In a formal report which Dr. Niepage drew up, he states:

"Out of convoys which, when they left their homes on the Armenian plateau, numbered from two to three thousand men, women and children, only two or three hundred survivors arrive here in the south. The men are slaughtered on the way; the women and girls, with the exception of the old, the ugly and those who are still children, have been abused by Turkish soldiers and officers and then carried away to Turkish and Kurdish villages, where they have to accept Islam. They try to destroy the remnant of the convoys by hunger and thirst. Even when they are fording rivers, they do not allow those dying of thirst to drink. All the nourishment they receive is a daily ration of a little meal sprinkled over their hands, which they lick off greedily, and its only effect is to protract their starvation."

Then he adds:

"'Ta'alim el aleman' (*'the teaching of the Germans'*) is the simple Turk's explanation to everyone who asks him about the originators of these measures."

He concludes his report with the statement:

"Only just before I left Aleppo last May (1916), the crowds of exiles encamped at Ras-el-Ain on the Bagdad Railway, estimated at 20,000 women and children, were slaughtered to the last one."

So well had the Turks learned their lesson from their German masters that "in many places on the road from Mosul to Aleppo," the

hands of little children were seen "lying hacked off in such numbers, that one could have paved the road with them" (p. 12).

And these atrocities are being perpetrated today. It is not ancient history. As in the case of the Serbians, and of the Southern Slavs within the Austrian Empire, every week brings further news of outrages as monstrous as any we have recorded. It is so clearly the duty of American patriots to acquaint themselves with the facts, and then to make them known to their neighbors—lest devils be forgiven before they have turned from their wickedness and repented—that we urge every reader of these pages to obtain full and current information from the American Committee for Armenian Relief, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York.

Now for Belgium and France.

Under this head it is important to read the *Report of the Committee on Alleged German Outrages,* presided over by the Right Hon. Viscount Bryce; published by the Macmillan Company, New York, at 10 cents.

The Committee responsible for this report consisted of men likely to err, if at all, on the side of the accused. Among them were Sir Edward Clarke, K.C., and Sir Frederick Pollock, K.C. They discarded all evidence which was not convincing, and were surprised to find how often depositions, "though taken at different places and on different dates, and by different lawyers from different witnesses," corroborated "each other in a striking manner."

The Appendix, which contains the *Evidence and Documents Laid Before the Committee,* includes many diaries found on dead German soldiers. It is printed separately and is also published by the Macmillan Co., New York; price 50 cents.

Other books and pamphlets which throw valuable additional light on the subject are:

German Atrocities: An Official Investigation, by Professor J. H. Morgan; published by E. P. Dutton and Co., New York, at $1.00.

The German Terror in Belgium, by Arnold J. Toynbee, published by G. H. Doran Co., New York, at $1.00.

Belgium and Germany, Texts and Documents, collected by Henri Davignon; published by Nelson & Sons, 381 Fourth Avenue, New York, at 25 cents.

The Destruction of Belgium: Germany's Confession and Avoidance, by E. Grimwood Mears, one of the Joint Secretaries to the Committee on alleged German Outrages; obtainable from G. H. Doran Co., New York; price 10 cents.

The Belgian Deportations, by Arnold J. Toynbee, with a statement by Viscount Bryce; published by G. H. Doran Co., New York, at 10 cents.

The German Terror in France, by Arnold J. Toynbee; published by G. H. Doran Co., New York, at $1.00.

Their Crimes, translated from the French; obtainable free of charge by writing to Cassell & Co., Ludgate Hill, London, E. C., England.

Most of these books and pamphlets can be obtained free of charge by writing to Professor W. Macneile Dixon, 8 Buckingham Gate, London, S. W. I., England, who generously has made it his business to spread a knowledge of the facts as widely as possible.

On August 4, 1914, the roads converging upon Liége, in Belgium, were covered with German Deaths' Head Hussars and Uhlans, pressing forward to seize the passage over the Meuse. From the very beginning, this sort of thing happened:

> "On the 4th of August," says one witness, "at Herve" (a village not far from the frontier), "I saw at about two o'clock in the afternoon, near the station, five Uhlans; these were the first German troops I had seen. They were followed by a German officer and some soldiers in a motor car. The men in the car called out to a couple of young fellows who were standing about thirty yards away. The young men, being afraid, ran off and then the Germans fired and killed one of them named D . . ."
>
> "The murder of this innocent fugitive civilian," the Bryce Report continues (p. 10), "was a prelude to the burning and pillage of Herve and of other villages in the neighborhood, to the indiscriminate shooting of civilians of both sexes, and to the organized military execution of batches of selected males. Thus at Herve some fifty men escaping from the burning houses were seized, taken outside the town and shot. At Melen, a hamlet west of Herve, forty men were shot. In one household alone the father and mother (names given) were shot, the daughter died after being repeatedly outraged, and the son was wounded. Nor were children exempt. 'About August 4,' says one witness, 'near Vottem, we were pursuing some Uhlans. I saw a man, woman, and a girl about nine, who had been killed. They were on the threshold of a house, one on the top of the other, as if they had been shot down, one after the other, as they tried to escape.'"

The Report suggests that the burning of the villages in this neighborhood and the wholesale slaughter of civilians, such as occurred at Herve, Micheroux, and Soumagne, may have been connected with the rage of the Germans caused by the resistance of Fort Fléron, whose guns barred the road to Liége. "Probably thinking that by exceptional severities at the outset they could cow the spirit of the Belgian nation, the German officers and men speedily accustomed themselves to the slaughter of civilians" (p. 11).

The Committee at that point appears to forget that terrorization is a recognized and prescribed feature of the German war-game. Officially, in its instructions to German officers (*Kriegsbrauch im Landkriege*, translated into English by J. H. Morgan, *The German War-Book*), the German Government, as early as 1902, warned its officers against "humanitarian ideas" (*humanitäre Anschauungen*), and declared that war must be waged "by all methods which promote the attainment of its object, subject only to such restraints as it imposes on itself in its own interest." Further: "To protect oneself against attack and injuries from

the inhabitants, and to employ ruthlessly the necessary means of defence and *intimidation,* is obviously not only a right but a duty of the staff of the army" (p. 120). Finally: "International law [as interpreted by the German Government] is in no way opposed to the exploitation of the crimes of third parties (assassination, incendiarism, robbery and the like) to the prejudice of the enemy" (p. 85).

It should also be borne in mind that German discipline, both military and civilian, is intended to brutalize the nature so that "inferior" races can be treated just as the Belgians were treated.

None the less we must assume that "practice makes perfect." The character of the German outrages became more and more monstrous.

The Germans entered Liége on August 7th. Arms in private hands had already been called in by the Belgian police, so that the Germans might not excuse their murders on the pretext that civilians had fired on them. The Germans found themselves in peaceful occupation of a great industrial city. But the forts around Liége had offered unexpected and exasperating resistance; many German soldiers had been killed, and the Belgian army was continuing its resistance as it retired on Antwerp, Ghent and Namur. The unfortunate city of Liége, therefore, was to be used as an example. On August 20th, a massacre took place in its streets. There is overwhelming evidence that this, and the burning of large sections of the city, were premeditated (Toynbee, pp. 47, 48).

Entries in a German soldier's diary, already quoted, show that on August 19th the German troops were allowed to give themselves up to debauchery (Bryce *Appendix,* p. 255)—something which certainly would not have happened, because German discipline is strict, unless countenanced by officers.

Next day (August 20th), houses in the Place de l'Université and elsewhere were fired systematically with benzine, and many inhabitants were burnt alive in their houses, their efforts to escape being prevented by rifle fire.

It will be best, however, to allow one of the witnesses to describe what he saw (Bryce *Appendix,* pp. 18, 19):

> "Before setting fire to these houses the Germans drove any inhabitants there were in them into the cellars. All the houses were inhabited, but some of the inhabitants had got away before the Germans came up to them. At about thirty of the houses, I actually saw faces at the windows before the Germans entered and then saw the same faces at the cellar windows after the Germans had driven the people into the cellars. One set of Germans, about twenty in number, would do all this at a house and then set fire to it. Altogether this took the whole morning. Before each house was burnt it was thoroughly searched by the men who brought out all sorts of furniture and put it on to wagons which were waiting outside. I also saw some of the men bringing out bags of money and handing them to their officers. There were about thirty officers in the street. I am quite sure of this. There were also a crowd of Belgian civilians in the streets. I actually saw all these houses set fire to. In this way thirty-five people were burnt. I know this from the list

which was put up in the police station afterwards and which I saw. One of the houses which was burnt was the house of a man I knew. He and two daughters, his nephew and niece were burnt there. His wife was away at the time. She had gone to Brussels the day before to see her parents. I know the family very well. . . . When I was in the Place St. Lambert when I heard shooting, I went to try and find where it was going on. In the Rue Soens de Hasse I saw civilians brought out of their houses. About 150 Germans under eight officers. They were paying house to house visits, bringing all the people out of the houses and forming them up in the street. I kept some little distance away and so did many other Belgians who were with me. The Belgians from the houses were marched off to the Place de l'Université between files of soldiers. I followed, keeping about twenty-five or thirty metres behind. When the Place was reached the Belgians were not formed up in any order, but the Germans fired on them. I heard an officer shout an order in German and all the Germans in one part of the square fired. The firing was not in volleys, and went on for about twenty minutes. Whilst this was going on other Germans were going into other houses in the square and bringing out more Belgians whom they put among those who were being shot. Altogether thirty-two were killed—all men. I counted the bodies afterwards. I saw all this from the end of the Rue Soens de Hasse. There were many Belgians with me, but none of us were attacked. When I saw any Germans coming I got out of the way. . . . After the shooting about seven or eight were finished off with the bayonet. Immediately after the men had been killed, I saw the Germans going into the houses in the Place and bringing out the women and girls. About twenty were brought out. They were marched close to the corpses. Each of them was held by the arms. They tried to get away. They were made to lie on tables which had been brought into the square. About fifteen of them were then violated. Each of them was violated by about twelve soldiers. While this was going on about seventy Germans were standing round the women including five officers (young). The officers started it. There were some of the Germans between me and the women, but I could see everything perfectly. The ravishing went on for about one and one-half hours. . . . Many of the women fainted and showed no sign of life. The Red Cross took them away to the hospital. While this was going on other Germans were burning the houses in the square."

In that German soldier's diary already quoted, under the date August 24th, we read: "We live like God in Belgium" (*Wir leben wie Gott in Belgien*).

And the German official defence? Practically this: Served them right! (See *The Destruction of Belgium,* by E. Grimwood Mears).

Worse than that, the cry of the women of Germany was and is: Served them right! Had not Belgium resisted the German advance?

But worse was to come. It was not merely that old women and children and cripples and priests were shot indiscriminately and wantonly; that babies were bayoneted and dangled on bayonets before their mother's

eyes; it was not merely that whole villages were burned and their inhabitants thrown back into the flames, under the direction of German officers and while perfect discipline was maintained; it was not merely that nuns, and little girls of twelve, and old women of sixty, and innumerable married women and single women, were violated in ways so obscene and so loathsome as to outdo the foulest records of any criminal court in the world. It was worse than this; for these German heroes, in order to impress the "inferior" race with a sense of German ruthlessness—which in Germany means superiority—developed the practice of cutting off the breasts of the women they violated and of leaving them, naked, to die, though frequently the Germans nailed the bodies of their victims to doors or tied them to trees (Bryce *Appendix,* pp. 120, 14, 82, 65, 112 and *passim*).

Very little has been stated publicly, for obvious reasons, about the violation of nuns. Cardinal Mercier wrote to von Bissing, the German Governor-General of Belgium, "that I could furnish him with no exact information, because my conscience forbade me to hand over to a tribunal of any kind the information (alas! very precise) in my possession. Outrages have been committed upon nuns" (*Cardinal Mercier,* by Stillemans, p. 74). An officer of the 11th United States Engineer Regiment, in a letter to Robert Ridgeway of the Public Service Commission, says: "A British Chaplain told me that he knows personally of a Belgian Convent where they found that fifty-seven out of eighty-two nuns had been violated when the boche fell back" (New York *Times,* December 10, 1917).

Perhaps it is necessary to give specific instances of some of the different outrages mentioned. Here is the affidavit of a Belgian soldier:

> "We were passing the flying ground outside Liége at Ans when I saw a woman, apparently of middle age, perhaps twenty-eight to thirty years old, stark naked, tied to a tree. At her feet were two little children about three or four years old. All three were dead. I believe the woman had one of her breasts cut off, but I cannot be sure of this. Her whole bosom was covered with blood and her body was covered with blood and black marks. Both children had been killed by what appeared to be bayonet wounds. The woman's clothes were lying on the grass, thrown all about the place. I was near J. B. at the moment we found the woman. I told Corporal V. what I had seen later on. I was marching on the outside of the patrol, on grass land, B. being next to me and the corporal closest to the regiment. J. B. cut the cords which held the woman up by stabbing them with his bayonet. The body fell and we left it there. We could not stop to bury the bodies because we could see the Germans following" (Bryce *Appendix,* p. 14).

Here is another:

> "On September 10th we came to the village of Haecht, and I and some others were sent out as a patrol; we passed a river and came to a farmhouse. On the door of the farm I saw a child

—two or three years old—nailed to the door by its hands and feet. It was clothed and quite dead. There was no wound of any sort on the body; the face was horribly drawn with pain. In the garden of the same house I saw the body of another child, a little girl of five or six; she had been shot in the forehead" (Bryce *Appendix,* p. 119).

And another:

"About 13th or 14th September [1914], we captured the village of Haecht from the Germans. We had, however, to retreat again. While resting we found a woman lying in the road naked to the waist. The breasts were cut right off—both of them. Lieutenant D. ordered us to cover the woman with a small German 'tent' we found close by in the haversack of a German, and we afterwards buried her. My section was with me at the time" (Bryce *Appendix,* p. 120).

This is the affidavit of a British non-commissioned officer:

"We were searching a village for a patrol of Uhlans at 3.30 p.m.—a small village of about fifty houses—we found them in a house; about ten got outside, but we did not let them get to their horses and we killed them all. On the ground floor in the front room—it was a house of about six rooms—there were ten Uhlans, who immediately put up their hands, and we took them prisoners. I sent them outside in charge of my men. I searched the house; everything was in disorder. On the floor in the corner near the fireplace I saw two women and two children, the ages of the former apparently about thirty and twenty-five. One was dead, the one I judged to be the elder. Her left arm had been cut off just below the elbow. The floor was covered with blood. I think she had bled to death. I felt her other pulse at once. I have been trained as a hospital attendant before I went into the reserve. She was quite dead, but not yet quite cold. Her clothing was disarranged, but may have been because she was rolling about in pain. The house had farm buildings attached to it, so I presume they were of the farmer class. I did not examine her for any other wound, as I was satisfied she had died of hemorrhage. The younger woman was just alive, but quite unconscious. Her right leg had been cut off above the knee. As she was on the point of death I could not summon assistance quickly enough to stop the bleeding even; I was sure she was beyond assistance then. There were two little children, a boy about four or five and a girl of about six or seven. The boy's left hand was cut off at the wrist and the girl's right hand at the same place" (Bryce *Appendix,* p. 232).

There are nearly three hundred closely printed pages containing testimony such as the foregoing and the following:

"As I looked into the kitchen I saw the Germans seize the baby out of the arms of the farmer's wife. There were three German soldiers, one officer and two privates. The two privates held the baby and the officer took out his sword and cut the

baby's head off. The head fell on the floor and the soldiers kicked the body of the child into a corner and kicked the head after it. . . . After the baby had been killed we saw the officer say something to the farmer's wife and saw her push him away. After five or six minutes the two soldiers seized the woman and put her on the ground. She resisted them and they then pulled all her clothes off her until she was quite naked. The officer then violated her while one soldier held her by the shoulders and the other by the arms. After the officer each soldier in turn violated her, the other soldier and the officer holding her down. . . . After the woman had been violated by the three, the officer cut off the woman's breasts. I then saw him take out his revolver and point it at the woman on the ground. . . . We ran into the fields and from there saw the farmhouse had been set on fire" (Bryce *Appendix,* p. 21).

As an example of the way towns and villages were treated, the case of Dinant will serve as well as any other. This is from the Belgian Official Report (see *The Crimes of Germany,* published by Horace Cox, London; pp. 39, 41; and *Reports on the Violation of the Rights of Nations . . . in Belgium,* by the Official Commission of the Belgian Government; pp. 81-110):

"On 15th August a lively engagement took place at Dinant between the French troops on the left bank of the Meuse and the German troops coming up from the East. On Friday, the 21st, about 9 o'clock in the evening, German troops coming down the road from Ciney entered the town by the Rue St. Jacques. On entering they began firing into the windows of the houses, and killed a workman who was returning to his own house, wounded another inhabitant, and forced him to cry 'Long live the Kaiser.' They bayoneted a third person in the stomach. They entered the *cafés,* seized the liquor, got drunk, and retired after having set fire to several houses and broken the doors and windows of others. The population was terrorised and stupefied, and shut itself up in its dwellings.

"Saturday, 22nd August, was a day of relative calm. All life, however, was at an end in the streets.

"On the following Sunday, the 23rd, at 6.30 in the morning, soldiers of the 108th Regiment of Infantry invaded the Church of the Premonstratensian Fathers, drove out the congregation, separated the women from the men, and shot 50 of the latter. Between 7 and 9 the same morning the soldiers gave themselves up to pillage and arson, going from house to house and driving the inhabitants into the street. Those who tried to escape were shot. About 9 in the morning the soldiery, driving before them by blows from the butt ends of rifles men, women, and children, pushed them all into the Parade Square, where they were kept prisoners till 6 o'clock in the evening. The guard took pleasure in repeating to them that they would soon be shot. About 6 o'clock a captain separated the men from the women and children. The women were placed in front of a rank of infantry soldiers, the men were ranged along a wall. The front rank of them were then told to kneel, the others remaining standing behind them. A platoon of soldiers drew up in face of these

unhappy men. It was in vain that the women cried out for mercy for their husbands, sons and brothers. The officer ordered his men to fire. There had been no inquiry nor any pretence of a trial. About 20 of the inhabitants were only wounded, but fell among the dead. The soldiers, to make sure, fired a new volley into the heap of them. Several citizens escaped this double discharge. They shammed dead for more than two hours, remaining motionless among the corpses, and when night fell succeeded in saving themselves in the hills. Eighty-four corpses were left on the Square and buried in a neighbouring garden.

"The day of 23rd August was made bloody by several more massacres. Soldiers discovered some inhabitants of the Faubourg St. Pierre in the cellars of a brewery there and shot them.

"Since the previous evening a crowd of workmen belonging to the factory of M. Himmer had hidden themselves, along with their wives and children, in the cellars of the building. They had been joined there by many neighbours and several members of the family of their employer. About 6 o'clock in the evening these unhappy people made up their minds to come out of their refuge, and defiled all trembling from the cellars with the white flag in front. They were immediately seized and violently attacked by the soldiers. Every man was shot on the spot. Almost all the men of the Faubourg de Leffe were executed *en masse*. In another part of the town 12 civilians were killed in a cellar. In the Rue en Ile a paralytic was shot in his arm-chair. In the Rue Enfer the soldiers killed a young boy of 14.

"In the Faubourg de Neffe the viaduct of the railway was the scene of a bloody massacre. An old woman and all her children were killed in their cellar. A man of 65 years, his wife, his son, and his daughter were shot against a well. Other inhabitants of Neffe were taken in a barge as far as the rock of Bayard and shot there, among them a woman of 83 and her husband.

"A certain number of men and women had been locked up in the court of the prison. At 6 in the evening a German machine gun, placed on the hill above, opened fire on them, and an old woman and three other persons were brought down.

"To sum up, the town of Dinant is destroyed. It counted 1,400 houses; only 200 remain. The manufactories where the artisan population worked have been systematically destroyed. Rather more than 700 of the inhabitants have been killed; others have been taken off to Germany, and are still retained there as prisoners. The majority are refugees scattered all through Belgium."

It is also characteristic of German methods that those of the survivors who were deported to Germany, were abominably treated, both during their journey and after their arrival. M. Tchoffen, the Public Prosecutor of Dinant, who was one of these prisoners, gives a graphic account of his experience. He says:

"We were treated like beasts in a menagerie. Officers and soldiers—and they were everywhere—gave the lead to the civilians. The women and children kept on insulting and using

> threatening gestures at us. . . . The journey lasted twenty-three hours. Once only had we anything to eat and drink, and we owed that to the Red Cross" (Belgian Official Report, pp. 99, 100).

Both in Belgium and France, the Germans constantly used civilians to screen their advance. Thus, at Mons,—"we waited for the advance of the Germans," states a British officer (Bryce *Appendix,* p. 176). "Some civilians reported to us that they were coming down a road in front of us. On looking in that direction we saw, instead of German troops, a crowd of civilians—men, women and children—waving white handkerchiefs and being pushed down the road in front of a large number of German troops." "They came on as it were in a mass," states a British soldier, "with the women and children massed in front of them. They seemed to be pushing them on, and I saw them shoot down women and children who refused to march."—"I saw the Germans advancing on hands and knees towards our position," states another; "they were in close formation, and had a line of women and children in front of their front rank." A Belgian standing in a side street saw the German tactics close at hand. He saw six of the victims shot by the Germans for trying to get away. The Burgomaster of Mons himself had been seized in the streets, and was driven forward with the others (Bryce *Appendix,* p. 177; Belgian Official Report, Vol. II, p. 136).

In France as in Belgium, arson, rape and pillage were the hall-marks of German occupation. After what has already been related, a single instance will suffice,—that of Gerbéviller. Here, as also at Lunéville, Hériménil, Rehainviller, Mont, Lamath, Fraimbois, St. Barbe, and at scores of other villages, the Bavarians proved themselves to be just as brutal as the Prussians.

> "From the moment of their entrance into the town the Germans [Bavarians] gave themselves up to the worst excesses, entering the houses with savage yells, burning the buildings, killing or arresting the inhabitants, and sparing neither women nor old men. Out of 475 houses, twenty at most are still habitable. . . . [Of the inhabitants] some were led into the fields to be shot, others were murdered in their houses or struck down as they passed through the streets, while they were trying to escape from the conflagration. Up to now thirty-six bodies have been identified (names follow) . . . Fifteen of these poor people were executed at a place called 'la Prèle.' They were buried by their fellow-citizens on September 12th or 15th. Almost all had their hands tied behind their backs; some were blindfolded. . . . In the streets and houses during the day the town was sacked and most tragic scenes took place.
>
> "In the morning the enemy entered the house of M. and Mme. Lingenheld, seized the son, thirty-six years of age, who was wearing the brassard of the Red Cross, tied his hands behind his back, dragged him into the street and shot him. They then returned to look for the father, an old man of seventy. Mme. Lingenheld then took to flight. On her way she saw her

son stretched on the ground, and as the unhappy man was still moving some Germans drenched him with petrol, to which they set fire in the presence of the terrified mother. In the meantime M. Lingenheld was led to la Prèle, where he was executed.

"At the same time the soldiers knocked at the door of the house occupied by M. Dehan, his wife, and his mother-in-law, the widow Guillaume, aged seventy-eight. The latter, who opened the door, was shot point-blank, and fell into the arms of her son-in-law, who ran up behind her. 'They have killed me!' she cried. 'Carry me into the garden.' Her children obeyed, and laid her at the end of the garden with a pillow under her head and a blanket over her legs, and then stretched themselves at the foot of the wall to avoid shells. At the end of an hour the widow Guillaume was dead. . . .

"Side by side with this carnage, innumerable acts of violence were committed. The wife of a soldier, Mme. X., was raped by a German soldier in the passage of her parents' house, whilst her mother was obliged to flee at the bayonet's point" (*Rapports et Procès-Verbaux d'Enquête de la Commission Instituée en Vue de Constater les Actes Commis par l'Ennemi,* pp. 27-29).

Occasionally, even a German began to feel uncomfortable. Thus (*The Crimes of Germany,* pp. 20, 33), Private Hassemer, 8th Corps, writes in his diary on September 3, 1914:

"Sommepy (Marne): Horrible massacre. The village burnt to the ground, the French thrown into houses in flames, civilians and all burnt together."

From another German soldier's diary:

"In this way we destroyed eight houses with their inmates. In one of them, two men with their wives and a girl of eighteen were bayoneted. The little one almost unnerved me, so innocent was her expression."

Truly it is not pleasant to descend into Hell. But if, to spare our own feelings, we refuse to do so, how can we hate Hell as it must be hated; how can we persist as we must persist if the world is to be protected against such unspeakable depravity, which crowns its own offence by claiming God as its "unconditional and avowed ally"!

T.

(To be continued)

ELEMENTARY ARTICLE

HIGHER AND LOWER NATURE

IN the last section is the statement that at first we do not know the difference between higher and lower nature, especially on the borderland where the contest rages. That statement requires elucidation and amplification.

Men and women live in a perpetual fog of self-deception and self-created illusions and delusions. They do so chiefly because they want to. They want to because they would have no peace from the urgings of their consciences if they did not. The same thought in another and simpler form is this: we all know what we ought to do, but we pretend that we do not because we do not want to do it. We cloud the question deliberately, dragging in any side issue or extraneous circumstance that will prevent a clear cut decision. As these general statements are not very convincing, or very clear, I shall use some homely illustration to explain my meaning.

A crude example would be this: We love hot bread but having weak digestions, we ought never to eat it. So we seek for every possible excuse to stifle our conscience and indulge our appetite. We go to a meal when, on a wheatless day, only hot corn muffins are served. The rest is easy. It is a patriotic duty to observe the wheatless day; of what importance is our digestion in comparison with the great issues of the war, and our pledge not to eat wheat bread; *ergo,* we eat the hot muffins. We may be uneasy, particularly after the indigestion has begun, but few consciences are proof against such reasoning. We entirely ignore two facts; one that we ought not to eat hot muffins; and the other, that there was no reason why we should have eaten the hot muffins except that we wanted to. All the rest was pure buncombe. We deliberately tried to fool ourselves.

We all do this sort of thing all the time and every day. The variations are infinite, but at heart they are always the same. I have seen a person eat candy, who should not have done so, and apparently convince himself that he did it to keep it away from a child for whom it would be bad; he *sacrificed* himself for the sake of the child. Yes, we are just as crude and silly as that.

She likes to have friends to dinner and her husband does not. Does

she go ahead anyhow and invite them because she wants to and in spite of his dislike? No indeed. She only asks them because he needs distraction, or because he ought to make friends that would help him in his profession, or what not. If he objects when he hears they are coming, does she tell the truth and say, she asked them because she wanted to? Again no. She argues with him, and tells him about all her good and disinterested motives, and she goes to bed full of resentment and in tears because she is so misunderstood. By this time she may be in some genuine perplexity as to the facts, for they lie buried under hours or perhaps days of dishonest thinking.

A friend asks us to take a walk, and we do not want to; we want to stay home and read. Do we say so. Dear me, no. We tell him the first cock-and-bull story that comes into our head, that we have letters to write or something—anything; and say we are sorry we cannot go. And we justify it on the ground of politeness, or that we did not want to hurt his feelings. This is a little different from the other cases, for we may face the issue frankly and not even pretend to believe our own lie. So that is not a very good illustration. Let us seek another, and one on a little higher plane. Here is a type which I often see.

A man makes a good resolution about some fault, let us say, that he will not criticize others. He sees someone do something wrong or do something badly. He is bursting with the desire to tell about it, but remembers his good resolution. Does he keep quiet? Not often. He decides that it would be better for the sinner's little guru to know about this fault so that he can help the sinner to cure it; or the sinner's friends ought to be told for the sinner's good; or maybe some individual ought to know about it so as to guard himself from the result of the sinner's weakness. There is always some justification, some reason, other than his love of scandal. Practically no one ever acknowledges to himself that he is a vicious and malicious gossip, and that that is the real reason he speaks evil of others.

Or let us take something not so unpleasant. I once decided that I would try not to defend or excuse myself. It was extraordinarily interesting and very humiliating to watch the gyrations of my mind under that strain. I think I kept the resolution for as much as forty minutes, during most of which I was alone. But the funny thing was not my unconscious, automatic and immediate breaking of this admirable rule, but the silly reasons I gave myself when it was not unconscious. I remember once deliberately excusing and defending myself because I was afraid a person who was interested in me would be disappointed and grieved if he thought ill of me where I was not guilty. At my office it was easy. Of course it was my duty there not to let my subordinates think I had made mistakes or done stupid things; that was not self-defense or self-excuse; it was simply and obviously good business. I discovered that my mind could invent forty thousand good and sufficient reasons why it was my plain duty to defend and excuse myself.

I also made another very interesting discovery, and that was that I was nearly always, no, practically *always,* actually guilty. We are very rarely unjustly accused. The best, or the most, we can say for ourselves is that sometimes, though rarely, we are not guilty of just the fault that is brought to our attention, or that it did not express itself in just the way pointed out. But that is more than sufficient to enable us to cloud the real issue. How many, many times we deeply resent a scolding, and lose its benefit, because the particular detail selected was one we felt to be unjust. I feel that I must make this point clear by illustration, for it is one of the commonest of our weapons of self-defense and of self-delusion. Let us take a liar. He knows he is a liar and is ashamed of it. It is a sore point with him, and therefore he particularly dislikes being reprimanded for it. He tells some story full of inaccuracies and exaggerations, is found out and scolded about it. The chances are that the person scolding him will, in the arraignment, speak of at least one detail where he feels that he was within the bounds of truth. That is enough for the lower nature. He is being unjustly accused, unfairly scolded. The fourteen lies he did tell are forgotten in his self-righteousness over the little bit of truth. The issue is clouded, the scolding wasted, the opportunity lost, and he goes off full of resentment and self-justification. How very often have I seen this operate. Nine times out of ten when you speak to a person of his faults, the whole effect of the lecture is completely lost because he does not think himself guilty of the particular illustration you happen to use. You scold a servant for being late. They usually are late, and it may be a chronic fault, but on that particular occasion it was the cook who was not ready. They go off inwardly triumphant and outwardly indignant because they were unjustly accused. We are all like that; the only difference is that some are more so than others. Any little fragment of excuse is seized upon for complete self-justification. The real facts are carefully ignored, and kept wrapped up in the cotton wool of self-deception and self-delusion.

I knew one man who read novels because he liked to read them, but who justified it on the ground that he wanted to improve his literary style. Lots of people drink because it is necessary for their health. Did not the doctor recommend it? I defy any one to think of any sin which people do not commit and then justify. The Germans justify the sinking of the *Lusitania* and the murdering and raping of women. Cannot you hear countless Germans telling themselves that they were not doing wrong to do those things, for was it not the order of their superiors, and is it not their duty to obey their superiors?

The nastier the fault, the more we seek this kind of justification. People guilty of treachery or disloyalty of any kind invariably have convincing reasons why this course was justified. When you come to think of it many novels deal with this theme. They describe the doing of something wrong and the temptations and reactions of the sinner, and his method of justifying his act.

We do things we should not because we are tired, or hungry, or bored, or early, or late, or glad, or sorry, or scared, or whatnot. I mean we do wrong things which we want to do, and use these conditions as our excuses. They are pretty feeble excuses but they serve.

This effort of deliberate self-delusion is not confined to the lower planes from which I have drawn my illustrations, and, of course, it is the more serious the higher up it is carried. It also becomes more subtle and more difficult to illustrate and trace. The whole purpose of self-examination, of which the devotional books make so much, is designed for no other purpose than to enable us to pierce through the self-created fog of illusion and deception with which we have surrounded our motives. Self-examination is a subject to itself of which more anon. This section is to show its necessity.

The mind is the great slayer of the Real. We habitually use our minds to obscure and nullify the promptings of our consciences, the admonitions of our friends, the advice and directions of our superiors, whenever we do not like what our consciences or friends or superiors say to us, and that is nearly always. We even pretend to ourselves that we do like to be scolded and that we are grateful, and that we will try to benefit by the experience, while all the time our minds are busy excusing and explaining and defending ourselves to ourselves, until any possible benefit is lost in a cloud of side issues and irrelevancies. Of course I am writing about things as they are, not things as they ought to be. I confess that it is deplorable, and also, that fortunately for all of us, there are people who do not behave this way. But do not run away with the idea that you are one of them. I have known a few, a very few, who honestly try to profit by the scoldings they receive. They not only recognize and accept the existence of their fault, but they are really grateful to the person pointing it out. Such people have travelled a long distance on the road to saintliness.

Which one of us prays a really honest prayer? Which one of us knows what a really honest prayer is? Who goes before the Master seeing himself as he really is, stripped of all disguise? It is said that only a disciple who is far along can do it, and that the first time he sees himself as the Master sees him it is more than his consciousness can bear.

C. A. G.

"Set me some great task, ye gods, and I will show my spirit!" "Not so," says the good heaven, "plod and plough."—Emerson.

REVIEWS

Egotism in German Philosophy, by George Santayana, has a distinctly alluring title to those who wish to see Germany discovered and beaten in every field of her activity. But a careful reading of the book leaves one almost completely disappointed with the inability of Germanized American philosophy to penetrate the cardinal viciousness of that by which it is still too inherently dominated. Generations of American philosophers have gone to school in Germany and learned their philosophy in German, and the mark of Cain is on them.

Dr. Santayana, true to form, has written with great brilliance of phrase, displaying at once wit, and, where he desired it, merciless condemnation, which reveals his own personal animus against German "transcendental, metaphysical idealism." He defines egotism, technically, as "subjectivity in thought and wilfulness in morals;" and he indicts the German people with the phrase—"There is no social or intellectual disease to which, in spots, they do not succumb, as to an epidemic: their philosophy is an example of this." But in an extraordinary way his own philosophy excuses them.

Although his central theme purports to be a discovery of Egotism in German thinking in order to prove that "The whole transcendental philosophy, if made ultimate, is false, and nothing but a private perspective," he is himself so imbued with the materialistic outlook on life, that probably unconsciously he plays right into German hands. The best parts of the book, containing less of criticism and more of descriptive narrative, are those chapters which survey the sweep of German philosophy—with its setting in Protestant theology, the "heir of Judaism,"—and the revelation of the "Seeds of Egotism in Kant," siezed upon and developed by Fichte and Hegel. Dr. Santayana sees the Protestant limitation in setting up self-will and private judgment on the foundation of a more or less fixed revelation;—the result is "to retain, for whatever changed views it may put forward, the names of former beliefs." This duplicity is sanctified by the secret feeling that the categorical imperative is "omnipotent." "God, freedom, and immortality, for instance, may eventually be turned into their opposites, since the oracle of faith is internal; but their names may be kept, together with a feeling that what will now bear those names is much more satisfying than what they originally stood for." Ruthlessness, furthermore, is the logical outcome of such a position, for "Kant expressly repudiated as unworthy of a virtuous will any consideration of happiness, or of consequences, either to oneself or to others. He was personally as mild and kindly as the Vicar of Wakefield (whose goodness he denied to be moral because it was natural), but his moral doctrine was in principle a perfect frame for fanaticism. Give back, as time was bound to give back, a little flesh to this skeleton of duty, make it the voice not of a remote Mosaic decalogue, but of a rich temperament and a young life, and you will have sanctified beforehand every stubborn passion and every romantic crime. In the guise of an infallible conscience, before which nothing has a right to stand, egotism is launched upon its irresponsible career." Again, "the categorical principle in morals, like the ego in logic, can easily migrate."

Fichte and Hegel, building upon this inherited tradition of self-assertion, proclaimed that "The German people are called by the plan of Providence to occupy the supreme place in the history of the universe." In this formulation of history, Egotism found its complete expression, and a reformulation of the perverted Messianic Kingdom ideal, whose adherents of old rejected and crucified the Christ.

But the source, though perverted, of the ancient ideal was a revelation from on High; the source of the German idea lies in a categorical imperative—"Something native and inward to the private soul . . . quietly claiming to rule the invisible world, to set God on his throne and open eternity to the human spirit. The most subjective of feelings, the feeling of what ought to be, legislates for the universe." Truly, "Egotism could hardly go further." Hence, though "self-assertion and ambition are ancient follies of the human race," the Germans "think these vulgar passions the creative spirit of the universe."

So far Dr. Santayana, dealing in a general way with general principles, is right and just. His expressions are often extreme, for he is constantly carried away by desire for effective rhetoric; and it is only by holding to his main purpose that at times one can steer clear of manifold self-contradictions. When, however, he comes to Nietzsche, apologizing for him, excusing him for his "keener and more heroic" romanticism, we discover the German in Dr. Santayana's thinking,—the fruits of admitting for years German dominion and of growing up intellectually in a Germanized atmosphere.

Dr. Santayana specifically disclaims close connection with German philosophy,—"I write frankly as an outsider"; but when he adds that his object is to describe German schools "intelligibly, and to judge them from the point of view of the layman, and in his interests," we assert that he failed of his last purpose, and seems unable to assume the position of the former. The kernel of German philosophy is that the German begins with himself and then ends with himself. Many philosophies begin with the present human consciousness, but they arrive at other states and conditions of consciousness. They start with an outlook that is included within their own narrow experience and they arrive at some comprehension of the experience of a whole universe. From a recognition of their own will, and the right exercise of it, they discover the harmony of co-operating and uniting with the wills of others. They recognize, in substance, another and an outside world, more real than they are except in so far as their self-consciousness enables them to partake of it.

But German transcendentalism, starting with the self's cognition of itself, never goes outside, but draws everything to itself. External experience is brought back into the ideas of it, and these are actually identified with that experience. These ideas in turn are drawn in and identified with the fact that the ego has the ideas. The Ego then feels "I am I," and adds to this the vague feeling that it is striving or tending towards something or other. Which sequence of thought, being reversed, means that the Personal Will, or Personal *Geist,* absorbs its ideas, its ideas absorb their outer experience of the phenomenal world; and this phenomenal world includes all outer things, whether past, present, or future. Therefore, "Earth and heaven, God and my fellowmen are mere expressions of my Will, and if they were anything more, I could not now be alive to their presence. My Will is absolute. With that conclusion transcendentalism is complete."

Though Dr. Santayana rejects such a system of philosophy as "a forced method of speculation, producing more confusion than it found and calculated chiefly to enable practical materialists to call themselves idealists and rationalists to remain theologians," how does he criticize it, and what does he offer as better?

The only philosophic grounds of Dr. Santayana's criticism lie in his chapters on "Egotism and Selfishness" and "Heathenism." An animal's will is a heathen will. He defines Heathenism as a religion of the will, the faith life has because it is life, and in its own aims just because it is using them. German philosophy is

therefore heathen; God becomes vital energy; freedom, personality; immortality, social progress. Happiness is not for wild animals; happiness is only for those who, in Nietzsche's phrase, are "tamed," and Nietzsche thought "the pursuit of happiness low, materialistic, and selfish."

Now Dr. Santayana, despite his criticism, is heathen in his own way. Whereas the crude Egotism and Heathenism of Fichte and Hegel and Max Stirner repel him, he is prepared to forgive Schopenhauer and Nietzsche. He himself defines happiness as "the union of vitality with art." In other words, this animal will to live and enjoy, the blonde beast roving lustful and free, is all right if restricted within the prescribed limits of refined and artistic expressions. Admitted that Art in its true and spiritual sense would be a safe guide, does not this standard, as things now are, leave it to each individual to determine what is, and what is not, an artistic expression of his particular vital energies? Is this not exactly a return to German self-will and egotism under a new guise?

Dr. Santayana claims that the blonde beast must learn wisdom from experience, a thing which German empiricists never do. But all systems of philosophy, including mysticism, and every effort to emancipate the individual from the rule of authority and tradition, can be labelled egotistic, on the principles employed by Dr. Santayana, because, though these systems are based on experience and not on subjective ideas, the interpretation of all experience is based on the needs and interests of each human being,—a return once again to the standard of the personal ego. Dr. Santayana, on the other side, would have us by no means return to obedience to a revelation or to an ideal, for, again, he would let instinct rule, instinct tamed by art.

It is Dr. Santayana's own materialism which makes him unable to distinguish between the self-will of the animal personality and the higher spiritual will of a creative and creating spiritual universe. He is writing solely of the personal, selfish, will-to-live, to be, to have. German philosophy is a glorification throughout of this lower will,—selfish, sensual, devilish; and Nietzsche is its chief prophet. The refinements of art to such a will are merely raising the degree and intensity of gratification by a species of self-control and restraint, calculated to give a higher form of pleasure. Nietzsche pretends to "drop the distinction between good and evil and transcend ethics altogether." Dr. Santayana comments that "Such a thought would not have been absurd in itself or even unphilosophical." We realize how far this is apart from the laws of the spiritual will when we remember that Christianity came not to destroy the law but to fulfil it, and that sacrifice is the cardinal principle of all spiritual, as also of all noble, courteous, and honorable living.

This book then, criticizes German philosophy for one form which its evil expresses, while defending another and, in a measure, a subtler form of exactly the same source of evil. False principles of German thinking are criticized by another set of false principles, which are a by-product of the very same root from which German philosophy springs. The final impression, therefore, is thoroughly unsatisfactory; and on a careless or unguarded reader the book might well have a distinctly pernicious influence, despite the rightness, in a way, of its primary intention. Though Dr. Santayana disclaims a direct philosophic contribution, the present volume appears to fail in being such far more by reason of its inconsistent thinking, than by any lack of studied brilliance or desire to address the professional philosopher. Perhaps its most disquieting feature is the new demonstration it offers of the subservience of even so-called independent American philosophy, to the German models which it has for so long admired.

JOHN BLAKE, JR.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Readers of THE THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY are invited to send questions to be answered in this Department, or to submit other answers to questions already printed where their point of view differs from or supplements the answers that have been given.

QUESTION No. 204 (*Continued*).—*What are the first steps toward becoming conscious of the invisible world? Is there not something that one may do to develop the vision for and the powers to function in the spiritual world?*

ANSWER.—There are several worlds now invisible to us, but of these it is only one that we should strive to become conscious of, viz., the inner world, or the "Kingdom of God." And the first steps toward that end are plainly stated in all great religions of the world. It can, without exception, be summed up in these words: "Purify your heart"; because it is only "the pure in heart" that shall see God. This first claim on all who want to scale the heavenly ladder it is very difficult for people of the present age to comply with, because it doesn't commend itself to our lower nature, nor is its indispensableness much understood. But unless it is met to some considerable extent, it is not only futile but in some cases even dangerous to try to climb higher. In some unexpected place of the ladder a step is rotten, and the climber will fall down and injure himself, or perish. Therefore, give full attention to the fulfilment of this first demand. Keep the commandments, —"live the life"; live up to your highest ideal of the perfect man,—or strive earnestly to do so always; and in time you will come to stand high.

Certainly there is something that must be done in order to develop the vision for and the powers to function in the Kingdom of God. *Meditate! Meditate! Meditate!* Unless you have acquired the power of *continual meditation* no vision for, nor any powers to function in that world can develop. And while striving to improve your meditation, you are strengthening your moral nature, thus making it easier to keep your heart clean;—"for you have no conception of the *power of meditation.*" In this way the heavenly ladder is gradually ascended, and when the disciple at last enters the Kingdom he will find that all powers, needed in that world, have developed while he was climbing.

Needless here to describe any special course of training in order to attain to continual meditation, since it has often been exceedingly well expounded in detail.

T. H. K.

ANSWER.—Some of these first steps have already been taken although not clearly recognized, perhaps, at their true value: there is one's consciousness of the now visible world, which has been achieved in the past; this, surely, is the first step, is it not? Then there is knowledge that the invisible world exists; not proof to silence the noisy mind, but direct knowledge of that world which we consciously enter through meditation or in prayer; this knowledge is the second step. The third step is a very long one, even though it is necessarily and logically

derived from the second step; the invisible world is not somewhere else, consciousness of it is not gained through some queer, fourth dimensional telescope; the invisible world is here and now, and we are living in it at every moment.

By the grace of our Masters, it is not necessary to make the entire conquest of each one of these steps before passing to the next; indeed, there can be true vision of the outer world only after consciousness of the inner world is attained, for the outer is but the vague and distorted shadow of the inner reality. If this be true, if the material world is but a *maya,* an illusion, what must be said of the psychic world which is, to most of us fortunately, a part of the invisible world? *Light on the Path* describes this psychic or lower astral world as a plane of unequalized forces where confusion necessarily prevails: A disciple, truly, would not expect to gain vision of eternal things by contemplating this psychic scrap-heap where the counterfeits and shams of the universe are piled in chaotic profusion.

It is a very definite part of the invisible world of which we wish to develop clear, personal consciousness; the spiritual world, the world of the Masters, these are but clumsy terms for designating a very definite and purposeful way of life, but, at least, they convey the impression of a world where wisdom and order prevail. The fourth step is the ordering of our lives so that they may be in rhythm with the life of those Beings in the spiritual world who are eager to aid us with their heritage of wisdom and of transcendent joy.

Does this seem somewhat vague and indeterminate, then ask some older student at what point you should begin, or write to the Secretary T. S., or to any of the contributors to the QUARTERLY with whose methods of expression you feel sympathy and understanding, addressing the contributor in care of the Editor.

Why should there not be something of personal guidance when an earnest student desires personal consciousness of the invisible world? Is it not conceivable that this is the goal of all previous lives and experiences?

We have been told that the Masters understand our problems and difficulties because they have passed through every one of them. If this be true, it seems a fair deduction to assume that there is an unbroken line of earnest students and disciples reaching from the newest member of the T. S. all the way up through the different grades of self-conquest and of knowledge to our Masters themselves.

There is, then, a point in the personal consciousness where contact may be made with the world where the Masters unceasingly work for humanity. This point is probably overlaid with much rubbish of careless thinking and self-centred action, but the point is there, and that the Masters are occasionally able to make connection with our minds through this point, in spite of the rubbish, is perhaps proven by the question itself. P.

QUESTION NO. 218.—*How can one cultivate the right kind of intensity of feeling and how learn to distinguish between the important and the unimportant things of the average life so as to avoid expending feeling on trifles?*

ANSWER.—Cultivate the practice of referring all things to the Master as a centre. In His eternal light, many of the fretting details of every day will fall away into their due perspective of insignificance. Study His standard of value—insensibly it may become your own. J. H.

ANSWER.—Would not a good test of the "right" kind of feeling be to ask oneself what the Master's feeling would probably be and to follow this same idea on and ask oneself whether this or that particular thing would be considered important or unimportant by the Master? If this were faithfully carried out I should think it would be one of the first steps towards learning to ask the Master directly and gaining the power to hear his answer. T. M.

ANSWER.—Feeling is a reward, not an end. When it is not spurious it springs from love and love comes from obedience—obedience to the highest that we can see. If we loved the Masters as we want to love them, we should obey their least wish with eager gladness. Our duties are the Master's will for us, that is what makes them duties. The testimony of all who have really tried it, is that the way to gain love is to *act as if* we loved as we want to love. Then, in time, the love is given.

True feeling is a precious gift and one not to be wasted. To learn to distinguish the important from the unimportant requires a sense of proportion and perspective, and this in turn requires a fixed point to which to refer all things. What is the purpose of your life and what your true desire? When that question is answered truly, if all things be referred to that fixed point, the important and the unimportant will assume their proper proportions. J. M.

ANSWER.—Let us suppose the questioner is a Republican, or a Democrat, and very loyal to his or her cause—could he or she not feel intensely, yet maintain a true balance between the important and unimportant things? Let a loyal political partisan become a candidate for office—would not his political intensity govern his least acts, without necessarily interfering with them? Is the Cause of Christ less important? G. WOODBRIDGE.

QUESTION No. 219.—*What is the rationale of intercessory prayer? I have thought that the answer to prayer must depend for its operation on the suppliant's own will? How can the will or petition of one man affect the will of another?*

ANSWER.—Here is a crude illustration that may be suggestive. A man, knowing that his friend is in a financial strait, may deposit a sum of money, with his friend's creditors. The strain is thereby relieved; but the friend may not be aware of the generous act, merely enjoying the freedom from the creditor's pursuit.

I believe that intercessory prayer is similarly effective, and that individual as well as national catastrophies are averted or lessened by such prayer. Monasteries and convents exist in order to maintain perpetual prayer of intercession.

S. M.

ANSWER.—The rationale of intercessory prayer would seem to be that of all vicarious atonement. There are a number of answers bearing on this point in the January, 1917, QUARTERLY, Question No. 210, in particular, one of great value, by Cavé.

No man lives to himself alone and it is a matter of every day experience that what one man is and does affects those with whom he comes in contact, making it easier or harder for them to do right. In other words, the action of his will affects the action of their wills. Prayer is an act of will and is a great power. We know that the Masters are always eager to help a man when they can do so without reactions that do him whom they would help more harm than good. May it not be that prayer makes force available on this plane which they can use without such harmful reactions?

Mr. Judge, in Volume III of the *Path* has an interesting article on the Astral Light as a great mirror from which the thoughts of men are thrown back to earth, thereby influencing all men to a greater or less extent. This, if we add the intelligent guidance of the Masters, may contain a hint as to the mechanics of intercessory prayer. J. M.

ANSWER.—Having read this question, the thought occurs to me of an answer

of a nine-year-old to his father, when asked why he expected the father to do something for him that the youngster wanted very much. "Because you're my Father." That small boy, it seems to me, may have had a clearer understanding of intercessory prayer than most of us grown-ups. He did not depend upon any rational processes. He accepted a situation and sought to benefit therefrom. How many of us accept as a fact-situation that the Master loves us far more than the best of human fathers may love? Even grown-ups ask for what they really want. The inquirer may find his or her will affected by the answers to this question—if effort be made to utilize them. Would this not be a case within the confines of the final clause of the question? How much trust and confidence and childlike faith does the inquirer put into the question of prayer? And in praying is St. Chrysostom's wise qualification—"as may be most expedient for them" kept in mind and heart? G. McK.

ANSWER.—What do you believe? When you were a child did you never appeal to your father for aid? If you wanted something that was good for you did he not give it to you—if he could, but, if you had starved your pet hawks to death, could he bring them back to life? Had he been able to use the Law, to do so, would it have been wise—would it not have made you even more careless? If you merely had thought or whispered a request, could he have heard you? If you had not put intensity of desire behind a request, would he have given it active attention? Did you never ask another to intercede for you in home or school or business? Like all analogies these are crude, but they may prove suggestive. We should remember too that by our sins and neglect we have builded walls between us and our Heavenly Helpers. Will and sacrifice are pick and shovel. Try using them. G. WOODBRIDGE.

CORRESPONDENCE

New York, December 17, 1917.

Editor THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY:

"Parenthood and Discipleship," by Mercy Farmer, an article which appeared in your last issue, contains a statement which, in my opinion, is not in accordance with the facts. It is alleged: "Nothing could have pleased the Devil more than to see those splendid, undisciplined, unorganized young Englishmen whose lives were so unhesitatingly thrown away in the second stage of the war—those days of the first of Kitchener's Army, when the British regulars were wiped out, holding the lines imperilled by their gallant, undisciplined comrades" (p. 162).

Granting that the Devil would have been pleased if the writer's premises were correct, the best proof that they are not correct lies in the fact that Kitchener himself allowed those men to fight; and he would not have allowed it if they had been undisciplined and unorganized: he would not have thrown away their lives. They had received longer training and discipline than the majority of men in the British army who now, for the first time, go to the front.

The writer's misstatement is an echo (of course unintentional) of the present tendency in the press to disparage Kitchener. The time will come when Great Britain, and even France, will recognize that they owe their continued existence to him, and that, though quite incidentally, the capture of Jerusalem and the success in Mesopotamia are due primarily to his insight, which, in its turn, was the fruit of his self-sacrificing devotion and theosophic breadth of vision.

AN OLD MEMBER, *T. S.*